DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 063 EA 023 591

AUTHOR Katz, Malcolm; Kimbrough, Ralph B.
TITLE Administrative Needs Assessment in Georgia: Summary, Trends, and State Policy Relationships.
SPONS AGENCY Georgia Educational Leadership Academy.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 81p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership Training; *Needs Assessment; *Principals; Staff Development; *Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS Georgia

ABSTRACT

From 1985 through 1989, studies were made annually of the administrative needs of school leaders in Georgia. This document functions as a guide for the Georgia Education Leadership Academy, as it looks ahead to the future of staff development for Georgia's school leaders. In 1985-87 and 1989, superintendents were asked to rate 61 common administrative task areas, according to the level of need in their own school systems. For two of these years, 1987 and 1989, the same information was sought in separate surveys of Georgia's school principals concerning needs of their own schools. Staff development coordinators were surveyed as to the needs of their school systems in 1988. During that same year, a special followup study of superintendents and principals probed more deeply into the 10 highest-ranked needs of superintendents and principals. The results of the study are broken into five sections: (1) Superintendents, Trends in Needs, 1985-1989; (2) Principals, Trends in Needs, 1987 and 1989; (3) State Policy and Administrators' Needs; (4) Relationships Between Needs and Selected Variables: Size/Socioeconomic Status, Cost Per Child, and Region of State; and (5) The 1988 Studies: Special Inquiries as to Administrative Needs as Perceived by Staff Development Coordinators, Georgia Superintendents Identifying Their Most Troublesome Administrative Problems, and Georgia Principals Identify Their Most Troublesome Administrative Problems. Eight tables are appended. (LAP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342063

ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENTS IN GEORGIA: SUMMARY, TRENDS, AND STATE POLICY RELATIONSHIPS

Prepared for

The Georgia Education Leadership Academy
Dr. Janie W. Smith, Director

by:

Malcolm Katz and Ralph B. Kimbrough

Professors of Educational Administration

Georgia Southern University

February, 1991

EA 023 591

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Katz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

IN GEORGIA:

SUMMARY, TRENDS, AND STATE

POLICY RELATIONSHIPS

Prepared for

The Georgia Education Leadership Academy
Dr. Janie W. Smith, Director

by:

Malcolm Katz and Ralph B. Kimbrough

Professors of Educational Administration

Georgia Southern University

February, 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Background and Purpose	4
I.	Superintendents, Trends in Needs, 1985-1989	5
II.	Principals, Trends in Needs, 1987 and 1989	20
III.	State Policy and Administrators' Needs	29
IV.	Relationships Between Needs and Selected Variables:	35
	Size/Socioeconomic Status	35
	Cost Per Child	37
	Region of State	39
V.	The 1988 Studies: Special Inquiries	41
	Administrative Needs as Perceived by Staff Development Coordinators	42
	Georgia Superintendents Identifying Their Most Troublesome Administrative Problems	44
	Georgia Principals Identify Their Most Troublesome Administrative Problems	44
VI.	Summary Comments	49
VII.	Appendices	
	Appendix A	52
	Appendix B	55
	Appendix C	60
	Appendix D	61
	Appendix E	63
	Appendix F	67
	Appendix G	68
	Appendix H	69

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writers want to express appreciation to others who have contributed to these research studies: to Dr. Steve Lang and Dr. John Daily for assistance in research and data processing methodology; to Dr. James Mullins and Patricia Mills for information on state legislation and State Board policy; to graduate students Mary Mazerik and Patti Tarpley for data processing; to Ms. Shelby Barnwell for organizing and handling survey mailings; and to Ms. Donna Colson and Ms. Beth Parrish for word processing.

We wish also to acknowledge the leadership of Dr. Jimmy Puckett and Dr. Sherman Day, former directors of the Academy, who had the vision to establish a research basis for the Academy's work and who contributed to the development of these studies.

Malcolm Katz

Ralph Kimbrough

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

For the period 1985 through 1989, studies were made annually of the administrative needs of Georgia's local school leaders. Beginning with the 1986 study, these were commissioned by the Georgia Education Leadership Academy. In four of these years, 1985-87 and 1989, superintendents were asked to rate 61 common administrative task areas as to the level of need in their own school systems. For two of these years, 1987 and 1989, the same information was sought in separate surveys of Georgia's school principals concerning needs of their own schools. In 1988, staff development coordinators were surveyed as to the needs of their school systems. And during that same year, a special follow-up study of superintendents and principals probed more deeply into the ten highest-ranked needs of superintendents and principals.

With high response rates from large samples (all superintendents, approximately one-third of all principals, and all staff development coordinators) a body of data has been collected, analyzed, compared and reported on an annual basis as to the perceived needs of Georgia's local school leaders.

The purpose of this report is to pull together that information in a way that will be of use to the Academy as it looks ahead to the future of staff development for Georgia's school leaders. For further review, readers may refer to all reports now in the office of the Georgia Education Leadership Academy or on ERIC file.

The reports of the annual studies, all authored by Malcolm Katz, were:

The Administrative Needs of Georgia's 187 Local School System: Results of a 1985 Survey. Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia. September 1985.

The Administrative Needs of Georgia's 187 Local School Systems: A 1986 Survey. The Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia. October, 1986.

The Administrative Needs of Georgia's 1986 Local School Systems: A 1987 Survey of Superintendents. The Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia. November, 1987.

The Administrative Needs of Georgia's Elementary and Secondary Schools: A 1987 Survey of Principals. The Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia. November, 1987.

Comparing The Administrative Needs of Superintendents and Principals in Georgia, 1987. The Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia. November, 1987.

Staff Development Coordinators Assess the Administrative Needs of Georgia's 186 Local School Systems: A 1988 Survey. The Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia. November, 1988.

Georgia Superintendents Identify Their Most Troublesome Administrative Problems: A 1988 Survey. The Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia. November, 1988.

Georgia Principals Identify Their Most Troublesome Administrative Problems: A 1988 Survey. The Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia. November, 1988.

The Administrative Needs of Georgia's 186 School Systems: A 1989 Survey of Superintendents with Comparisons by Size/Socioeconomic Status, Cost per Child, and RESA. The Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia. January, 1990.

The Administrative Needs of Georgia's Schools: A 1989 Survey of Principals with Comparisons by Elementary or Secondary, Size/Socioeconomic Status, Cost Per Child, and RESA. The Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia. January, 1990.

NOTE: Summaries or "Highlights" of these individual reports were written and published each year, and distributed to the respondents of that year's survey(s).

I. Superintendents, Trends in Needs, 1985-1989

In the spring of the years 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1989, surveys were conducted to ascertain the administrative needs of Georgia's local school systems, as perceived by their superintendents. (A special 1988 follow-up study on superintendents and special sections of the 1989 study not treated here will be dealt with later in this report.) While the 1986, 1987, and 1989 studies were not exact replications of the 1985 survey, the data gathering instrument, sampling technique, and inquiry approaches were essentially identical. A single-page survey instrument was mailed to each local superintendent in Georgia, accompanied by a memorandum encouraging response along with a memorandum of instructions for responding. (A copy of one such mailing may be found in Appendix A.) The survey instrument in each year listed task areas that were arranged under six headings; these task areas consist of the areas of work and responsibility common to local school

administrators.* Each year, superintendents were asked to rate each of the 61 task areas at levels from "0" (no need) to "4" (high need) as they perceived it in their own school systems.

The six categories of task areas were: Organization and Administration; Management of Students; Communications Management and Public Relations; Management of Facilities, Services and Finance; Management of Instruction; and Personnel Management.

The response of superintendents to these surveys was excellent as is shown below:

Table 1

Response of Superintendents to Surveys

	No. Supts. GA	No. Supts. Sent Survey	No. Supts. Responding	Percent Response
1985	187	187	158	85%
1986	187	187	164	88%
1987	186	186	153	82%
1989	186	186	160	86%

The data gathered each year yielded basic information such as the mean score for each task area, the rank (1-61) of the task area, and the per cent of superintendents rating the task area as a "4". We were able to show the priority of superintendents needs by region of the state, among other cross tabulations.

In the material that follows, we will interpret some trends of the findings of the 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1989 studies and make some judgments as to what they may imply for the future.

---

*The first survey instrument was developed in collaboration with Ms. Carol Budack.

A. Comparing The Ten Highest Ranked Needs of 1989 With The Composite of Needs, 1985-1989

Those needs of superintendents that ranked highest in the most recent survey, together with those whose four-year composite ranked highest, are key trend data for pointing to needs most likely to be of high rank in the near future.

Table 2

A Comparison of the Ten Highest Ranked Needs in the 1989 Survey with the Ten Highest Ranked By Composite Mean Score, 1985-1989

	1989	Mean Score	1985 - 1989	Composite Mean Score
1	School-societal problems (drug abuse, teen pregnancy, etc.)	3.04	Supervision, evaluation of staff	3.18
2	Staff morale, group dynamics	3.04	Instructional supervision	3.12
3	Strategic planning	2.99	Evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	3.07
4	Instructional supervision	2.90	School-societal problems (drug abuse, teen pregnancy, etc.)	3.04
5	Knowledge of curriculum/instruction	2.89	Staff morale, group dynamics	3.00
6	Evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	2.88	Knowledge of curriculum/instruction	2.99
7	School-parent communication	2.86	Principal's role	2.97
8	Interpersonal relationships, rapport	2.85	Knowledge/use of leadership techniques	2.88
9	Supervision, evaluation of staff	2.81	School-parent communication	2.87
10	School-community communication	2.81	Strategic planning	2.86

The chief trends related to these needs are as follows:

		1985	1986	1987	1989
1.	School-societal problems	------	------	------	1 (rank)

Presented as a survey item in 1989 only, this task area represents a major concern of superintendents. This appears to reflect the reality which has been growing steadily, that we are seeing new and pressing evidence of this need. Drug problems, poverty and near-poverty among children, single and no-parent families, and teen pregnancy are but some of the issues thrust upon the local school system and its superintendent, regardless of how

broadly or narrowly he or she defines the mission of the schools. These societal problems interact with the educational program of the schools in ways that are persistent, complex, and direct.

Our projection is that the task area ("School-societal problems (drug abuse, teen-pregnancy, etc.)" will remain as the #1 or #2 need for the next survey year.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
2. Staff morale and group dynamics	6	5	5	2

This need continued to rise and is related, we think, to the pressures and challenges for change associated with educational reform which, in early 1989, were still being played out in Georgia. If there is a turn-around in state policy towards greater local initiative (empowerment, school-site management, etc.) we could see a reduction of problems in this area. We need to be reminded, however, that democratization of the school enterprise (more voice for teachers, etc.) tends to produce not only greater satisfaction for the participants, but also more open expression of dissent and dissatisfaction. Managing team decision-making in organizations that were previously more autocratically led will require greater skills in this task area.

Our projection is that this task area will continue to elicit a high rank, among the top five, from superintendents.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
3. Strategic planning	10	14	8	3

This task area continues to be a high need for superintendents, attributable, we think, to the state mandate that local school districts develop and submit strategic plans. We believe that long-range planning, the kind that involves environmental scanning, estimates of future financial and human resources, reexamination of mission, and complex proposals for action is a very demanding activity, one which, in the absence of state requirement is characteristic typically of only very well-positioned school systems, those which sense its value, are willing to commit the resources of staff and time, and with the collaborative relationships among Board, administrators, and staff to pull it off.

Therefore, our projection is that "strategic planning" will remain a high need for superintendents statewide only if the state's requirement is continued. If it is removed or weakened, it will decline over the short term.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
4. Instructional supervision	2	2	2	4

It is noteworthy that this task area has remained a high-ranked need, while "Supervision, evaluation of staff" which had been the highest ranked need 1985-1987, declined to 9th in 1989. We believe the difference is that the statewide staff development program on teacher evaluation by the Academy made a positive and immediate impact on

teacher evaluation, but has not resolved problems of instructional supervision (nor was it intended to).

We project that there will be a continuing emphasis on instruction and quality teaching which require the broader applications of instructional supervision tending to keep this task area in the forefront of needs. Emphases on empowerment and collaboration could raise the need level in this area even higher. If, however, there is a state policy shift towards such movements as greater community involvement in decision-making, we could see a decline in this and in other needs that have a more instructional focus in favor of needs in organizational and leadership areas.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
5. Knowledge of curriculum/instruction	4	4	6	5

Our observations here are similar to those above. If there is no major change in state emphasis, this need will remain high. If we should witness a surge of emphasis at state and national levels on local initiatives in curriculum (for example whole language, teaching about religion, schools of choice) the need level could rise even higher.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
6. Evaluating program effectiveness, implementing change	3	3	3	6

We might have expected that after several years of the programmatic elements of reform (more emphasis on the basics, graduation requirements, core curriculum, etc.) we would have witnessed an emphasis on program evaluation. ("Had the reform elements worked?"). We interpret the trend data above to indicate first, that it has diminished as reform became assimilated. Secondly, we see a backlash against measurement due, we think, not only to the sheer quantity of testing, but to its not having been used to evaluate and modify educational program.

We seem to be witnessing now the beginning of the next wave of reform, which has more to do with local initiatives than with state programs. If that change occurs it may bring with it a wavelet of curricular and instructional innovation, and also a renewed interest in process rather than output. The longer term, however, should witness a swing back to measurement and outputs which historically has followed periods of local initiative and innovation.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
7. School-parent communication	7	9	10	7

The needs in this task area have been higher than "School-community communication" during each of the four survey years. (See No. 10, below.) It is our projection that this task area will retain its high-need position, and could rise even higher. The strength of the need in the area of school-societal problems (see No. 1, above), combined with the continuing public perception that educational results are not improving,

when added to pressures for greater community and parental involvement, will be factors undergirding the need strength in this task area.

It is noteworthy that all of the communication task areas in the surveys - schools/staff; school/parents; school/community - have consistently ranked among the highest of the 61 task areas. Thus, this category of "communication" should be a continuing agenda item for leadership staff development.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
8. Interpersonal-relations, rapport	15	8	9	8

It has been our view that the high level of concern in this area has been related to the pressures and challenges accompanying educational reform. If state educational mandates should diminish in the next wave of reform, and if the players at the local level are encouraged to work out their own improvement efforts, we may have the dynamics for both decreasing and increasing the need level in this area (see No. 2, above). On balance, however, it is more likely that the rank of this need will diminish if prescriptive mandates are relaxed.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
9. Supervision, evaluation of staff	1	1	1	9

For three survey years this was the highest ranked need. In 1989 it dropped to the near-bottom of the list of ten highest ranked needs. Its early high rank was clearly related to state, local, and national concerns with teaching quality, with state reform requirements having the most pointed impact. We have analyzed in prior reports the precipitous drop in need between 1987 and 1989, and see it as related to the effectiveness of the Leadership Academy workshops for all Georgia administrators in 1988, and the subsequent perception of superintendents that this need was met substantially by those efforts.

We project that while this task area will require continuing attention, it will not rise in need level in the near future. It should be met by second-phase training that builds on the successful first-phase training that focused on the statewide teacher evaluation instrument.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
10. School-community communication	9	11	12	10

Communication needs, always high for school systems, will grow even stronger, we believe, in the period ahead. (See discussion of No. 7, above). These needs will accelerate if:

a. there is a return to local systems of some decision areas that had been acquired through educational reform by the state, such as the management of teaching methods (note the recent elimination of TPAI).

b. there are professional and state policy emphases on teacher empowerment, school-site management, and (more remotely) "schools of choice".

B. Five Other Task Areas That Bear Watching

The school superintendents identified five other task areas that bear close watching as potential high-level needs in future needs assessments. A brief comment will follow each stating our reason(s) for its inclusion.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
1. Principal's role (in instruction)	5	5	4	11

We have attributed the decline in this need area to the increased involvement of principals in instructional matters, most significantly those relating to teacher evaluation. If state education policy reflects a "next wave" reform emphasis on restructuring (see discussions, above), we could witness a second surge of concerns in this area.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
2. Knowledge, use of leadership techniques	8	7	7	14

Again, if state policy tilts in the direction of greater local initiative through restructuring, we could see a rise in the need level of this area.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
3. a. Communication with students	35	32	29	17
b. Discipline, due process	38	35	35	20
c. Student involvement	45	42	40	21

We are not at all sure that the similar pattern of rising need levels in all three of these areas shows a specific relatedness among them, nor why they are all consistently rising. One possibility is that concerns with student discipline are pulling the other two areas upward. We have noted in prior studies that superintendent perceptions of need in this area seemed to lag well behind the public's perception as shown by annual PDK polls, but that they were rising.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
4. Recruitment, selection of personnel	40	39	37	36

In each study report we have called attention to the relatively low level of perceived need in the area of recruitment and selection of personnel in the face of state and national projected shortages and concerns about teacher quality. Both the projection of shortages and concern for quality would advocate aggressive staff recruitment and selection strategies. We may see a sudden surge of concern in this area as shortages of qualified teachers worsen.

	1985	1986	1987	1989
5. Decision-making, problem solving	21	23	18	23

If professional emphases or state policy thrusts in Georgia should move rapidly in the direction of teacher empowerment, restructuring, community involvement, or school-site management -- in short, toward more participative leadership models--the concerns in this area will rise. This fundamental leadership skill may then be perceived as more critical to school improvement. Superintendents who lack skill and understanding in this task area may flounder, mistaking manipulation of staff and tokenism in decision-making for the powerful elements of participative management, or on the other hand, using unnecessarily cumbersome involvement structures for all decisions.

C. Other Trends and Patterns

1. Consistency of High Needs

Table 2, below, shows the ten highest-ranked needs for each of the four annual needs assessments of superintendents.

Table 3

TOP TEN by RANK

	1985		1986		1987		1989
1	Supervision, evaluation of staff	1	Supervision, evaluation of staff	1	Supervision, evaluation of staff	1	School-societal problems
2	Instructional supervision	2	Instructional supervision	2	Instructional supervision	2	Staff morale/ group dynamics
3	Evaluating program effectiveness	3	Evaluating program effectiveness	3	Evaluating program effectiveness	3	Strategic planning*
4	Knowledge of curriculum/instruction	4	Knowledge of curriculum/instruction	4	Principal's role in curriculum/instruction	4	Instructional supervision
5	Principal's role in management of instruction	5	Principal's role in management of instruction	5	Staff morale/ group dynamics	5	Knowledge of curriculum/ instruction
6	Staff morale/ group dynamics	6	Staff morale/ group dynamics	6	Knowledge of curriculum/instruction	6	Evaluating program effectiveness
7	School-parent communication	7	Knowledge/use of leadership techniques	7	Knowledge of leadership techniques	7	School-parent communication
8	Knowledge/use of leadership techniques	8	Interpersonal relationships, rapport	8	Long, short term planning	8	Interpersonal relationships, rapport
9	School-community communication	9	School-parent communication	9	Interpersonal relationship, rapport	9	Supervision evaluation of staff
10	Long, short term planning	10	School climate, learning environment	10	School-parent communication	10	School-community communication

* was "long, short-term planning, 1985-1987

As we look back at the forty needs identified as highest, ten per survey year, the overall impression is one of a very high level of consistency in superintendents' selections from year-to-year. (There are also important shifts in needs priorities, which will be dealt with later.) Only thirteen different administrative needs comprise the entire set of forty. Superintendents were presented with sixty-one different task areas, yet only thirteen

different areas were selected consistently among the highest through four surveys over a five-year period. This is a strong indication that the general, compelling high needs of superintendents have remained basically the same from year to year during this period. While we will discuss later the important shifts in rank among these thirteen areas pointing to different annual priorities and while the rank of many other task areas have important implications, these thirteen comprised the target needs of superintendents 1985 through 1989.

2. Three Areas Of Needs That Were Predominant

Instructional leadership tasks, relationship-centered tasks both within the system and spanning between schools and community, and planning, are the general areas that describe the highest needs of superintendents during this period. If we compare the top thirteen task areas that make up these three general areas with some of the task areas that had a composite rank below 30th during the four years, our view of the top thirteen needs may sharpen by contrast:

Task area	Composite Rank 1985-1989
Discipline, due process	36
Recruitment, selection of personnel	41
Maintenance and operations (facilities)	44
Appropriate materials, equipment	48
Board-administrator relations	51
Employee benefits	61*

We might have expected these selected administrative tasks areas to rank higher among superintendents' needs, yet none had a composite rank as high as the middle of all survey items. In contrast, the thirteen task areas with the highest composite rank comprise all of the highest ten needs for the four years of comparable needs assessments.

Table 4 shows the average mean of all survey items, 1985-1989:

*with minor changes in the survey items during 1985-9 the total number of different items was 65. Each year's survey instrument consisted of 61 items.

Table 4

The Average Mean of All Items, 1985 - 1989, Superintendents Surveys

Item	Average	Item	Average
supervision, evaluation of staff	3.18	discipline, due process (students)	2.44
instructional supervision	3.12	assessing, reporting student progress	2.43
evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	3.07	short-term planning	2.40
school-societal problems	3.04	task differentiation, clarity	2.40
staff morale, group dynamics	3.00	absenteeism (personnel)	2.38
knowledge of curriculum, instruction	2.99	recruitment, selection of personnel	2.35
principals role (in management of instruction	2.97	innovations, research	2.32
knowledge/use of leadership technique	2.88	accounting, record keeping	2.29
school parent communication	2.87	maintenance and operation (facilities)	2.28
strategic planning	2.86	updating policies, procedures	2.24
interpersonal relations, rapport	2.83	management by objectives (administrative)	2.22
school community communication	2.80	varied resources to meet needs	2.19
school climate, learning environment	2.71	appropriate materials, equipment	2.19
school-staff communications	2.70	energy conservation (facilities)	2.18
staff involvement	2.70	resource utilization, professional	2.13
classroom management	2.69	board-administrator relations	2.10
defined K-12 curriculum	2.68	purchasing and distribution	2.02
computer, data processing	2.67	career ladders	2.02
systems for information dissemination	2.63	capital outlay projects	2.01
legal considerations	2.63	vertical/horizontal organization	2.01
decision making, problem solving	2.62	financial reports	1.97
inservice for staff (certified and classified)	2.62	pupil accounting (F.T.E.)	1.94
defined expectancies, disciplinary	2.60	transportation	1.90
scheduling, lesson planning, time-on-task	2.59	managing federal and staff projects	1.86
crisis, conflict management	2.59	school food and nutrition	1.85
time management	2.54	employee benefits	1.84
communication with students	2.54	merit plans	1.83
organization for curriculum development	2.54	organizational culture	1.82
budgeting, preparation and control	2.54	extra-curricular programs	1.76
stress management	2.52	student publications	1.68
knowledge/use of policies, goals	2.52	AVERAGE	2.44
testing, placement, promotion/retention	2.52	STD	.37
guidance, career planning	2.51	MIN	1.68
student involvement	2.50	MAX	3.18
staff, corrective discipline	2.48		

3. Important Shifts Within the Overall Pattern of Consistency

While the bird's-eye view of needs shows that the same thirteen task areas persisted as high needs, a focus on each year's results tells us that there have been some important shifts in priorities, as is shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Selected Task Areas, Showing Shifts Among High-Ranking Items

Task Area	Rank 1985	1986	1987	1989
Supervision, evaluation of staff	1	1	1	9
Instructional supervision	2	2	2	4
Principal's role (in instruction)	5	4	4	11
Staff morale, group dynamics	6	6	5	2
Strategic planning	10	14	8	3

We conclude, therefore, that while prior needs assessments provide valuable information to program planners, a single year can bring with it important shifts in local priorities. For this reason, needs assessment should be as current as possible. Incidentally, as the Georgia Education Leadership Academy and school district supervisory personnel carried out intensive training in these areas, the ranking of needs appeared to change.

4. Mean Scores and High Rank Don't Tell the Full Story

In addition to rank by mean scores, each of the four survey studies yielded a score for each item that provided a different clue as to its level of need. This was "the percent of superintendents rating the task area as a '4' (high need)." We have called this score previously a measure of the "potency" of an item, implying that this was an item which was critical to those superintendents who rated it at the '4' level. A task area which had a relatively modest mean score might have attracted nonetheless a sizable number of superintendents as a "high need" item. (It must also be noted that the items with higher mean scores typically elicited more "high needs" responses.)

Below are shown eight task areas in 1989 that elicited a middling rank (below 15th) but which attracted more than one in five respondents as a "high need."

	Rank	% of Superintendents rating as a "4" (high need)	Equivalent No. of Georgia Superintendents
Legal considerations	18	28%	52
Budgeting, preparation and control	31	28%	52
Stress management	28	25%	47
Classroom management	16	22%	41
Communications with students	17	21%	37
Crisis, conflict management	19	21%	37
Decision-making, problem solving	23	21%	37
Recruitment, selection of personnel	36	21%	37

The significance of this for the Academy's program planning is that there are needs which might be passed over on a criterion of rank alone, but which would have a potential market of thirty-seven or more superintendents for whom the need is critical (21 percent of 186 superintendents). The reader is referred to Appendix B for a full listing of all task areas by rank and showing percent of superintendents rating as a "4" (high need) for all four survey years.

5. Consistent "Gainers" and "Losers"

A task area that has risen in rank each year (gainer) shows a clear trend in the growth of that area as a need, while one that has declined each year shows the diminishing strength of that need. A steadily rising or falling rank, viewed in the context of environmental change (such as state policy emphasis, national trends, etc) can lead to more informed judgments as to including or excluding these areas as topics of future leadership academy programs. Table 6, below, shows consistent gainers and losers 1985-1989.

TABLE 6

SUPERINTENDENTS
Consistent Gainers/Losers, 1985-1989

Areas that consistently moved up through the years

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Staff morale, group dynamics	6	6	4	2
Communication with students	35	32	29	17
Student involvement	45	42	40	21
Recruitment, selection of personnel	40	39	37	36
Appropriate materials, equipment	50	45	45	42

Areas that consistently moved down through the years

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Computer, data processing	11	13	24	29
Career ladders	17	43	56	61
Testing, placement, promotion, retention	24	25	28	37
Assessing, reporting student progress	29	29	34	41
Task differentiation, clarity	31	37	38	38
Merit plans	44	53	60	60

6. Stability and Change

Over the five year period of surveys, some needs have changed in rank a good deal, while others have changed little, not only from one year to the next, but through all four years. Table 7, below, shows the ten task areas that have shown the most, and the ten that have shown the least change, 1985-9. For a complete list of all task areas and their changes, the reader is directed to Appendix C.

TABLE 7

The Ten Task Areas Most and Least Changed, 1985 - 1989

Most Changed			Least Changed		
Task Area	Std.	Chg.	Task Area	Std.	Chg.
Career ladders	.51	-1.37	Updating policies, procedures	.04	.00
Merit plans	.35	-.93	Managing federal and state projects	.04	.02
Absenteeism (personnel)	.16	-.45	Legal considerations	.05	.02
Supervision, eval. of staff	.22	-.43	Inservice for staff (certified and classified)	.06	-.02
Computer, data processing	.14	-.33	School food and nutrition	.07	-.02
Assessing, reporting student progress	.12	-.29	Recruitment, selection of personnel	.01	.03
Student involvement	.25	.28	Stress management	.02	-.03
Instructional supervision	.14	-.22	Staff involvement	.06	.03
Evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	.13	-.21	Organization for curriculum development	.08	-.03
Testing, placement, promotion, retention	.10	-.21	Purchasing and distribution	.03	-.04

D. The Needs of Superintendents by Region of State

Because the staff development services of the Academy address the needs of administrators throughout the state, and often take place in locales other than Atlanta, the assembling of data by region was thought to be of value. We have taken two different approaches to examining the needs of superintendents in terms of regional location. From 1985 through 1987 we used five regions, North, North Central, Central, Southwest, and Southeast, based on the regions defined by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission in its study, The Principalship in Georgia: Superintendents Perceptions, 1984. In each of the reports we cited the districts for each region, identified the ten highest ranked needs of each, compared them with the statewide results, and analyzed and interpreted the results.

In the 1989 studies, our approach changed. We determined that we would organize data regionally on the basis of the 16 Regional Education Service Areas (RESA's) in which superintendents participated. A review of that part of our 1989 studies, is treated later in this report in Part IV, under the heading, "The Relationship Between Needs and Selected Variables: Administrative Needs and RESA's."

II. PRINCIPALS, TRENDS IN NEEDS, 1987 AND 1989

Following the assessments of superintendents of 1985 and 1986, we carried out in 1987 and 1989 needs assessments of Georgia's principals. These two studies closely replicated the pattern that had been established for the superintendents. While all local superintendents were invited to participate, however, a one-third sample of principals was asked to respond.* The survey instrument in 1987 and 1989 presented 61 task areas which are the common concerns or activities of school leaders, organized under six headings. (See p. 6, above). In both 1987 and 1989 the 61 task areas were the same for principals as for superintendents. Each principal was asked to rate each of the task areas at levels from "0" (no need) to "4" (high need) as he or she perceived it in his/her own school.

The response rates to the surveys of principals were:

	No. Principals Sent Survey	No. Principals Responding	Percent Response
1987	600	425	71%
1989	567	396	70%

The data gathered yielded basic information such as the mean score for each item, the rank of the item, and the percent rating each item as a "4". Comparisons were shown for elementary and secondary schools, and by region of the state, among other comparisons.

In the material that follows, we will interpret the findings of the 1987 and 1989 studies that parallel the earlier studies of superintendents. Because the 1989 studies of both principals and superintendents revealed additional data on needs *vis a vis* three other variables (size/socioeconomic status, cost per child, and RESA of system), a separate section of this report is devoted to those variables. (see Part IV)

A. Comparing the Ten Highest Ranked Needs, 1987 and 1989

While management needs outweighed instructional needs in 1987, that emphasis became even stronger in 1989. By that year, nine of the task areas ranked by principals among the ten highest of 61 items were primarily management needs, as shown in Table 8, below.

* For 1989, this was a 29 percent sample, or two of every seven principals.

TABLE 8

Comparing the Ten Highest Ranked Needs, 1987 and 1989

PRINCIPALS

	1987	Mean Score		1989	Mean Score
1	Evaluating program effectiveness	2.72	1	Stress management	2.74
2	Stress management	2.68	2	School-societal problems	2.62
3	Computer and data processing	2.68	3	Staff morale, group dynamics	2.62
4	Legal considerations	2.64	4	Legal considerations	2.59
5	Supervision, evaluation of staff	2.62	5	Evaluating program effectiveness	2.55
6	Instructional supervision	2.57	6	Time management	2.50
7	Time management	2.56	6	Crisis, conflict management	2.50
8	In-service for staff	2.51	8	Strategic planning	2.45
9	Staff morale, group dynamics	2.49	9	School-community communications	2.43
10	Classroom management	2.44	10	Computer and data processing	2.41

We noted in our 1989 study the contrast between this finding and the predominance of instructional needs selected by superintendents throughout the four survey years. (see Table 3, p. 13) For ratings of all 61 task areas, 1987 and 1989, see Appendix D.

We have also observed that four *instructional* needs that had ranked in 1987 among the highest ten for principals dropped below that level in 1989:

	1987 Rank	1989 Rank
Supervision, evaluation of staff	5	27
Instructional supervision	6	16
In-service for staff (certified & classified)	8	17
Classroom management	10	12

B. Principals Statewide: What We Have Learned

1. "Supervision, evaluation of staff" dropped from fifth in 1987 to 27th in 1989, which we believe to have been a strong indicator that Georgia's efforts to improve teacher evaluation realized some positive results. We have noted earlier that the major intervening

events between 1987 and 1989 were the state-wide training program directed by the Georgia Leadership Academy and the implementation of a uniform evaluation instrument. The implication from this data is that we have here an instance of a prescriptive state policy that worked well when supported by a focussed Academy staff development program. We have also, however, described some of the negative reactions to top-down policy directives and some of the limitations of statewide uniformity in instrumentation and staff training.*

It is our recommendation that staff development in this task area proceed from training ("How to use the instrument") to conceptual, technical, and human-relations levels that deal with the more challenging supervisory and confrontational aspects of evaluation. While the first-phase objectives of the evaluation program apparently have been met, the longer-term need is for a cadre of principals whose skills greatly exceed minimal competence.

2. It appears to us that downward pressures on principals to improve instruction tend to heighten their concerns in areas of management and leadership. These principals have told us that they need support and improvement with managing their staffs in the areas of stress, group dynamics and morale, legal problems, evaluating program and implementing change, crisis and conflict management, and time management. They have told us that they need support also in managing their relationships with students and community, as exemplified by their high rankings of school-societal problems and school-community communication. Finally, as was also true of superintendents, they need help with strategic planning.

We believe it is important to distinguish between these complex and vital management concerns, and the kinds of routine administrative chores that often come to mind when discussion turns to the principal's role as primarily managerial or instructional. Indeed, such tasks as "Accounting and record-keeping" (46th), "purchase and distribution" (52nd) and "pupil-accounting (F.T.E.)" (55th), rank near the bottom of Georgia's principals' priorities.

Our recommendation here is that the Academy give high priority to one or more of these management topics on its statewide development agendas.

---

*Katz, Malcolm, "What Can Data on the Critical Needs of Administrators in Georgia Tell us About Statewide Teacher Evaluation", in Georgia Educational Leadership, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1988.

3. We believe that the high rank of "School-societal problems (drug abuse, teen pregnancy, etc.) as 2nd in 1989 for principals, bolstered by the even higher ranking by superintendents in 1989 of that item (see Table 2, p. 7) is especially notable. For those who might attribute this alone to concerns with "discipline", the evidence here does not support that. (See rank of "discipline" survey items, Appendix E).

Our analysis here parallels that in 2, above. While the principal's target is "instruction", some of the circles around the target that establish the context of instruction are made up of such societal ills. The point here is not that we declare impotency in instruction in the face of the social problems of the schools, but rather that we recognize the realities with which principals contend and attempt to arm them with the tools needed to deal with those realities.

4. Our conclusion as to the high rank of "strategic planning" (8th) mirrors that which we offered earlier in response to its high rank (10th) given by superintendents: to the extent that such planning remains an important state policy, it will remain a priority for principals. Should the state's leadership back away from this policy, it will weaken as a priority over the short term. Should local initiatives gain ascendancy, with new emphases on school-site management, participatory leadership, and community involvement, it will regain importance as a concern only over the longer time frame.

C. Mean Scores and High Rank Do Not Tell The Whole Story

One of the conclusions to be drawn from our two needs assessments of principals is that while an item might have a middling rank, it could have attracted nonetheless a substantial number of principals as being a critical need. We find such needs when we look at those whose rank was below 15th, but elicited a rating of "4" (high need) from more than 20 percent of all principals. For the last year of the principals needs assessment, 1989, the task areas meeting those two criteria are shown below:

	Rank	% Principals rating as a "4" (high need)
Principal's role (in management of instruction)	29	25
Instructional supervision	16	24
Discipline, due process	18	23

The point being made here is that program planners should look beyond high rank to fathom the current and future needs of principals. [The reader is referred to Appendix E for a full listing of all task areas by rank and showing percent or principals rating as a "4" (high need), for both survey years.]

D. Shifting Ranks: What Do They Mean

In each of our surveys we have looked at one or more measures of change in the priorities of principals as revealed by the shifting of ranks among the items. One of the measures available is the standard deviation of change (in rank) over the two surveys for each item, along with the absolute amount of change in the rating. These are shown for all survey items in Appendix F. Thus we can find that certain items remained very stable, as for example:

	STD	Change in Mean Score
Stress management	.03	.05
Time management	.03	- .05

and that other survey items shifted a great deal, as for example:

Career ladders	.38	- .77
Supervision, evaluation of staff	.25	- .50

Using change as a pointer or flag, one can then investigate other facts associated with these survey items, either as a means of understanding the reason(s) for unusual change or stability or as a predictor of future rank. For example, exploring the first two items above and their ranks for 1987 and 1989, we find:

	Rank 1987	Rank 1989	STD	Change in Mean Score
Stress management	2	1	.03	.05
Time management	7	6	.03	.05

Here, then, are two task areas of relatively high rank and high stability.

Exploring the second two items and their 1987 and 1989 ranks, we find:

	Rank 1987	Rank 1989	STD	Change in Mean Score
Career ladder	30	59	.38	-.77
Supervision, evaluation of staff	5	27	.14	-.28

We have concluded that (a) career ladders began at a middle-level among 61 survey items, and dropped to near bottom, undoubtedly related to the shift downward in the states priorities, and (b) supervision, evaluation of staff, which ranked high in 1987 and much lower in 1989 was pushed out of its earlier high rank by the Academy's massive program efforts in this area.

A second device for using change from one survey year to the next is to identify those items that have ranked in the upper half of the items (ranked 1-31) and which have changed five or more ranks, as shown in Table 9, below.

Table 9

Principals, 1987 and 1989

TASK AREAS RANKED 1-31: CHANGES OF 5 TO 9 RANKS

Started high and ended lower

	1987	1989
Computer and data processing	3	10
In-service for staff	8	17
Staff, corrective discipline	13	22
Scheduling, lesson planning, time on task	16	23
Principal's role (in management of instruction)	21	29
Defined K-12 curriculum	28	33

Started low and ended higher

	1987	1989
Staff morale, group dynamics	9	3
Crisis, conflict management	14	6
School-parent communication	18	11
Interpersonal relationships, rapport	24	15
Systems for information dissemination	26	20
Varied resources to meet needs	29	24
School-staff communications	31	26

From the set of task areas that started high and ended lower, it is of interest that principals were much less concerned about their own "principal's role" in 1989 than they were in 1987. We might speculate that they had been brought in the interim more firmly into the instruction-related activities of their schools, most likely by their enlarged role in teacher evaluation.

From the second set of task areas, those that started low and ended higher, it may be of interest that of the seven items, five are either relationship- or communications management task areas.

E. Elementary and Secondary Principals

In each of the two needs assessment surveys of Georgia's principals we have compared elementary with secondary. Were their needs convergent or divergent? What were the very high priority needs for each group, etc? From the 1989 survey, for example, one important comparison is shown below in Table 10. (For all elementary and secondary results, see Appendix E.)

Table 10

Comparing Elementary and Secondary Schools in 1989:
The Ten Highest Ranked Administrative Needs
By Mean Score

Elementary Principals		Secondary Principals	
Rank	Task Area	Rank	Task Area
1	Stress management	1	School-societal problems (drug abuse, teen pregnancy, etc.)
2	Staff morale, group dynamics	2	Staff morale, group dynamics
3	Legal considerations	3	Stress management
4	Evaluating program effectiveness; implementing changes	4	Evaluating program effectiveness; implementing changes
5	Crisis, conflict management	5	Time management
6	Time management	6	Instructional supervision
7	Strategic planning	7	Crisis, conflict management
8	Computer and data processing	8	Legal considerations
9	School-societal problems (drug abuse, teen pregnancy, etc.)	9	School-community communication
10	School-community communication	10	School-parent communication

As can be seen in Table 10, above, the needs of elementary and secondary principals in 1989 tended to be much more alike than different. When asked to rate an array of 61 different task areas, they selected the same eight among their ten highest needs. In 1987, they selected six as common to both groups among their ten highest needs.

There were, however, important differences in both surveys between the two groups. For example, in 1989 "computer and data processing" was a major need of elementary schools (8th) but of lower priority to secondary principals (17th). As we concluded in our

1989 report, "the conventional wisdom that there are vast differences in the nature of the problems --- of elementary and secondary principals turns out to be largely untrue."

Finally, staff development program planners may wish to take into account both the similarities in the agendas of both groups which point to joint training sessions, and to specific significant differences which might be better served through separate sessions.

F. The Needs of Principals By Region of State

Academy programs for principals often take place in locales other than Atlanta, addressing the needs of principals from one or more of the regions of the state. For these reasons, we assembled the data on a regional as well as on a statewide basis. The regional unit selected for the principals study in 1989 was the RESA (Regional Education Service Area) serving the school system in which the principal was employed. There are 16 RESA's in Georgia, and because not all systems participate in a RESA, results were reported also for the set of principals whose school systems do not have a RESA affiliation. This regional dimension of the needs of principals is reviewed later in this report in Part IV, under the heading, The Relationship Between Needs and Selected Variables: Administrative Needs and RESA's.

III. STATE POLICY AND ADMINISTRATOR'S NEEDS

Our experience in assessing administrators' needs in Georgia, 1985-1989, reveals several kinds of linkage between state policy and the concerns of superintendents and principals.

1. Tight Linkage Between Policy and Administrators' Needs

During this period which corresponded to the implementation period of the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE), several results from our needs assessments have demonstrated the power of the legislature and the State Board of Education (acting through the Department) to set the agenda for local administrators. Some examples follow.

a. "Supervision, evaluation of staff" (survey item)

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	1(rank)	1	1	9
Principals			5	27

This task area is referred to several times in sections of the Q.B.E. Act:

20 - 2 - 210	Evaluation of Personnel
20 - 2 - 200	Certification and Recertification of Professional Personnel
20 - 2 - 282	Comprehensive evaluations, among other references

Evaluation of personnel is also found in several State Board policy initiatives, among which are:

GBI	Evaluation of Personnel (adopted 6/85; revised 11/85; deleted 11/86; adopted 4/89
GBI	Evaluation (adopted 7/89 - regulation)
GBBA	Performance Based Certification (adopted 5/87)
GBI	Evaluation of Professional Personnel: State (adopted 11/86)

Superintendents made this their #1 needs priority in 1985, 1986, and 1987. It dropped to 9th in 1989, as we have reported earlier, related to the Academy's training program for virtually every administrator in the state during 1988. Principals responded in a very similar way to this area of need, as the rankings for 1987 and 1989 show, above.

We have here an illustration of the power of the state to establish local need and the power of the Academy to meet that need, at least at the initial level of policy implementation. Other examples were:

b. "Instructional supervision"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	2(rank)	2	2	4
Principals			6	16

The Q.B.E. reference follows:

20 - 2 - 244 State Board's Efforts to Improve Education

c. "Evaluating program effectiveness; implementing change"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	3	3	3	6
Principals			1	5

Q.B.E.: 20 - 2 - 280 Statewide Education Improvement Plan
S.B.E.: Improvement Plans and Projects (adopted 12/85)

d. "Knowledge of curriculum, instruction"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	4	4	4	5
Principals			11	21

Q.B.E. 20 - 2 - 140 Quality Basic Education Curriculum
S.B.E. IDA Curriculum (adopted 7/85)

e. "Strategic planning"

	1985*	1986*	1987*	1989
Superintendents	10	14	8	3
Principals			15	8

Q.B.E.: 20 - 2 - 280 Statewide Education Improvement Plan

j. "Computers, data processing"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	11	13	24	29
Principals			3	10

For the 1985, 1986, and 1987 surveys, this item was "Long, short-term planning".

We cannot, of course, establish a cause-effect relationship between these state policy initiatives and local needs priorities. When considered in the broader context of the local superintendent's and principal's work-life, however, some judgments can be made without venturing too far into realms of speculation. First, pressure from state mandates for new emphasis (e.g., staff evaluation) probably raised administrators' concerns about their readiness to comply. Consequently, there was an immediate felt need for training to relieve the areas of insecurity created. Second, as training for these heightened tasks relieved these concerns, the needs once given high priority were relegated to lower ranks. This is not to say that state policy was the sole stimulus for such need; rather, that is was a compelling stimulus, perhaps among others.

2. Correlational Linkages Between State Policy and Administrative Needs

Our assessments revealed instances in which there appeared to be a correlational rather than cause/effect linkage. We found, for example, a very high priority given by administrators to "school-societal problems".

In 1989, the only year it appeared on the surveys, it ranked as the #1 need for superintendents and the #2 need for principals. While there were state policy initiatives related to this topic, as for example: Q.B.E.: 20 - 2 - 142 Required Course Offerings, and S.B.E.: JGCC Communicable Diseases: Aids (adopted 6/87), it is likely that the direct and daily impact of such issues as drugs, pregnancy, child abuse, etc. was the more immediate cause for the high levels of administrators' concerns, and was also the cause for state policy makers to adopt their policies.

3. Linkage That Reflected the General Impact of Reform Rather Than Its Specific Requirements

One of our earliest findings from the first survey was the high rank of several administrative task areas that had no specific analogs in state legislation or board policy. These were in the areas of leadership, management, human relations, and communications. Examples were:

a. "School-parent communication"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	7(rank)	9	10	7
Principals			18	11

b. "Interpersonal relations, rapport"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	15	8	9	8
Principals			24	15

c. "Principals role" (in management of instruction)

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	5(rank)	4	4	11
Principals			21	29

d. "Staff morale, group dynamics"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	6	6	5	2
Principals			9	3

e. "Knowledge/use of leadership techniques"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	8	7	7	14
Principals			32	34

Indeed, some of these relationships between administrative needs and the general impact of reform (on morale, relationships, principal's role, parent communication, etc.) led us to observe that "when the State Legislature or State Board gets a cold, the superintendents get the flu and the principals get pneumonia." We do not want to overdo the point. Education reform was a cure, not the disease. But it had its major side-effects.

4. Some Sharp Differences in Needs Between Superintendents and Principals

There have been different responses from principals as compared with superintendents with regard to some task areas. Example of such differences were:

a. "Stress management"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	27(rank)	33	27	28
Principals			2	1

b. "Time management"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	23	30	30	27
Principals			7	6

c. "Crisis, conflict management"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	30	20	26	19
Principals			14	6

Results such as these led to our observing in 1987 that principals have felt the consequences of the reform movement in a way that more acutely pressured their work-lives. More importantly, these differences have produced a set of priority needs for principals which are different than the priority needs of superintendents.

5. Unfunded Policy Initiatives Do No Drive Local Needs

In the immediate pre-Q.B.E. period (1983-84), the notion of the "career ladder" was much discussed, studied, and debated throughout Georgia. Q.B.E. was enacted in 1985, with section 20 - 2 - 213 authorizing a career ladder program.

The 1985-89 history of this item as a need was as follows:

"Career ladders"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	17(rank)	43	56	61
Principals			30	59

With state funding for career ladders delayed, superintendents increasingly came to view it as a dead issue, finally ranking it 61st among 61 survey items. Principals in 1989 gave it similar short shrift, ranking it at 59th. What can we learn from this, aside from the obvious? Perhaps it is that a policy initiative which gets its thrust so predominantly from the top, without having very much positive response from local educational leaders, has no followers when state sails slacken.

6. State Policy Initiatives Do Not Create A Local Need When Local Capabilities Are Adequate.

Notorious among administrators as an administrative burden, (but with grudging recognition of its usefulness) F.T.E. accounting was required by section 20 - 2 - 160 of Q.B.E. This task area was included on our survey list of 1989 to sense a level of local need. Superintendents ranked it 51st; principals ranked it 55th saying, in effect, "no problem."

Other examples of state policy being matched by low levels of local need were:

a. "Accounting, record keeping"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	46	38	32	47
Principals			49	46

Policy reference: S.B.E.: DIB Financial Reports and Statements; DID Local School System Audits (adopted 8/86).

a. "Budgeting, preparation and control"

	1985	1986	1987	1989
Superintendents	26(rank)	28	20	31
Principals			47	36

Q.B.E.: Section 20 - 2 - 167

S.B.E.: DC Local System Annual Operating Budget; DCCA Local Budget Deadlines/Schedules, (among several others, all adopted 8/86).

We conclude, therefore, given that all superintendents and principals were required to execute these policy directives, that they did not perceive them as higher level needs because there was little gap between their goal to comply and their capacity to meet it.

IV. THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN NEEDS AND SELECTED VARIABLES

A. Administrative Needs and Size/Socio-Economic Status
B. Administrative Needs and Cost per Child
C. Administrative Needs and RESA's

The surveys of 1989 of superintendents and principals went beyond the earlier surveys of 1985 through 1988. In addition to the usual inquiries, the administrative needs of these administrators were reviewed and compared based on three additional variables. The first of these was a combination of size and socio-economic status (S.E.S). The second variable was cost per pupil. The third was location of school district, that is, the 16 RESA's (plus those with no RESA affiliation).

Needless to say, this kind of inquiry generated a great deal of information, including twenty-three additional tables for superintendents and thirty for principals, plus two appendices in each report. (A list of tables can be found in each 1989 study. See p. 5, above.)

A. Administrative Needs and Size/Socioeconomic Status

For both superintendents and principals, school systems were divided into six groups based upon the percentage of students eligible to participate in the free lunch program, called "the statistically best demographic predictor of student achievement." (Student Assessment Program, State Summary, 1987-1988). While the Student Assessment Program divided all systems into eight groups by enrollment, we collapsed their four mid-sized systems into two, yielding for our study: two groups of large systems (one of higher and one of lower S.E.S), two groups of mid-sized systems, again with an S.E.S division, and two groups of small systems, also divided on the basis of S.E.S. Size and S.E.S criteria were spelled out for each of these six groups of school systems in the reports. For each group of systems, tabular information compared the ten highest ranked administrative needs of that "size/S.E.S" group with the administrators statewide (either superintendents or principals, as appropriate to the study). A discussion of these findings followed for each of the six size/S.E.S groups, noting especially patterns of convergence and divergence with the analogous statewide group of either superintendents or principals, and any unique features of the administrative needs of that size/S.E.S group. At the close of this section of the 1989 principals' report (p. 25) and in the "Summary and Conclusion" sections of both reports, overall findings were presented. Excerpts of these are restated here:

From the principal's report, p. 25:

"While the schools from each of these six groups of systems presented a needs profile that was unique, four of the groups selected a pattern of highest needs that were very similar to the statewide pattern. Groups I - IV, that is, the two groups of large systems (high and low S.E.S.) and the two groups of mid-sized systems (high and low S.E.S.) selected eight or nine of the same task areas among their highest ten ranked needs as did the statewide sample. The patterns of needs of Groups, I, II, III, IV were also simple to discern: a predominance of pressure-laden managerial needs, with a majority of instructionally-related needs. Staff developers working with principals from large and mid-sized schools systems can address a relatively common pattern of high needs, without regard to distinctions as to the size and socioeconomic distinctions among their systems."

"Two of the groups, Group V (smaller, higher S.E.S. systems) and Group VI (small, lower S.E.S. systems) presented needs profiles that were (1) very different from the statewide pattern and (2) very different from each other. Group V was more complex: a predominance of instructional needs, followed by communication and outreach task areas as high needs, with virtually none of the pressure/managerial needs. In the schools of small, lower S.E.S. systems a wider gamut of needs emerges, including managerial needs, policy and goals needs, instructional needs, and "discipline" needs. Staff developers working with principals from small school systems should avoid any prejudgments about their priorities. They share relatively few high-priority needs with the statewide sample and each has a different highest priority needs. Their needs profiles should be studied with some care for an understanding of their major concerns."

"Very few needs appear to correlate highly with size/S.E.S., that is, needs that were consistently and significantly higher or lower among the three higher S.E.S. groups than each of their lower S.E.S. paired groups. One such was "Discipline, due process", which was in each pair of groups a higher priority concern for the lower S.E.S. group than in the higher S.E.S. group. We find that a *priori* assumptions about needs based on the socioeconomic status of systems turn out to be unsupported, suggesting that staff developers seeking to meet locally felt needs must examine the data rather than acting on untested assumptions."

From the "Summary and Conclusions" section of the superintendents report of 1989, p. 63:

> "Superintendents' ratings of needs were also examined according to their systems' placement in one of six categories of size/ socioeconomic status. These six were large-high and large-low S.E.S.; mid-sized-high and mid-sized-low S.E.S.; and small-high and small-low S.E.S. school systems."
>
> "While the results for each of these six categories of school systems portrayed a unique profile of needs, each with its own special "flavor", there was also much similarity among them. All six groups placed on their select lists at least five of the ten highest needs selected by superintendents statewide. Only two of the six groups, however, selected the same task area as its highest ranked need, "Strategic planning". Small school systems, in both the higher and lower S.E.S. groups, tended to be the most divergent from the statewide group. They also showed a special focus of concern related to in-school and classroom-based types of task areas."
>
> "Mid-sized school systems, both higher and lower S.E.S., tended to be most similar to the statewide group."
>
> "For large, higher S.E.S. systems, virtually all of their high ranked needs were in the "management" domain rather than the "instructional" domain. Superintendents of large, lower S.E.S. systems on the other hand, were more like the statewide group."
>
> "In summary, there appears to be sufficient uniqueness within each of the six size/S.E.S. groups to warrant the special attention of staff developers who anticipate serving superintendents within any of the groups. There also appears to be sufficient similarity, however, for staff developers to address the needs of a mixed groups of superintendents (those from all categories of size/S.E.S) by utilizing statewide results."

B. Administrative Needs and Cost Per Child

In this section of each of the two 1989 survey reports, we inquired into the relationships between the needs of Georgia's administrators and the cost per pupil of their school systems. Utilizing the latest data then available (State of Georgia, Department of

Education, Cost Per Child in A.D.A., 1986-87, May 10, 1988), we divided the respondent superintendents (and also the principals) into six sub-groups by cost per child, as follows:

Group A	Highest Cost per Child: Above $4000
Group B	Second-Highest Cost per Child: $3300 - $4000
Group C	Upper-Middle Cost per Child: $3000 - $3299
Group D	Lower-Middle Cost per Child: $2650 - $2999
Group E	Second-Lowest Cost per Child: $2350 - $2649
Group F	Lowest Cost per Child: Below $2349

For each report, the ten highest ranked needs of either the superintendents or principals whose school systems were in each of the six cost sub-groups were compared with the ten highest ranked needs of the analogous set of administrators statewide. Also, other data such as the percent of superintendents responding from that group were included. Discussions of the findings relating needs to cost per pupil followed, with emphasis on the comparison between the needs of each sub-group with the state-as-a-whole. For each sub-group of superintendents, a "Needs Profile Summary" was provided, summarizing its similarities to the statewide sample and the peculiar needs of that sub-group.

An additional section of the principals report (pp. 34-36) asked "Are There Any Consistent Relationships Between Administrative Needs and Cost per Pupil?", and the results were shown in a "Comparison of Rankings by Cost per Pupil of 20 Selected Task Areas" (pp. 35-36). At the close of this section of the principals report (p. 36) and in the "Summary and Conclusions" sections of both reports, overall findings were presented. From the principals study, p. 36 we reported:

> "While each of these six groups of schools, from highest cost/pupil to lowest cost/pupil school systems, expressed unique administrative needs, the overall picture in the state is one of greater similarity than differences. No group selected fewer than six task areas among their ten highest ranked needs of those selected by the statewide sample."
>
> Task areas that were unique to groups are worthy of special attention by staff developers. Examples of this are "Innovations,

research" selected by the highest cost/pupil group and "Recruitment, selection of staff" by the lowest cost/pupil group. Each group's profile of needs is somewhat unique in the positioning of their task areas among the ten highest if not in the selection of different task areas."

"There are some interesting correlations between cost/pupil and intensity of need, both positive ("Innovations, research," for example) and negative (communications with staff, parents, and community, for example). Few of these correlations are sufficiently high to warrant a generalized inference that would enable a staff developer to predict need level based on the system cost/pupil of the principal."

From the 1989 superintendents study we reported our summary findings as follows (p. 64):

"There are greater similarities than differences among these groups, as to their administrative needs. For instance, each of these groups placed on its select list at least six of the ten highest ranked needs of all systems statewide."

"Differences among the groups are noteworthy, however. The second-highest cost group ($3300 - $4000), for example, ranked instructionally-related needs higher, and had fewer high needs in the area of communications. The upper-middle cost group ($3000 - $3299) expressed an especially high level of concern related to boards, policies, and budgeting. The second-lowest cost group ($2350 - 2649) perceived "Instructional supervision" as its top-ranked need, and also showed greater interest in school-parent communications and in the role of the principal. The lower-middle cost group ($2650 - $2999) mirrored most closely the needs profile of superintendents statewide."

"In summary, each cost group was unique in its pattern of administrative needs, and will warrant the attention of staff developers working with superintendents gathered together on this basis. It is also true, however, that there existed greater similarities than differences among these groups."

C. Administrative Needs and Region of State

Because the Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA's) include staff development as one of their functions and are at times called upon to coordinate statewide staff development programs, the RESA was selected as the geographic subunit of the state

for the 1989 studies. This was thought to be an improvement upon our earlier studies which had used a five-region (North, North Central, Central, Southwest, and Southeast) organizational framework for analyzing administrative needs by geographical area.

For both the superintendents and principals studies in 1989 the descriptive data on the systems included were drawn from Regional Education Service Agencies, Annual Report, November, 1988, and included the sixteen RESA's that served 179 of Georgia's 186 school systems. The seven school systems that did not at that time participate in RESA's, then having a combined enrollment of about 12 percent of the state's students, were included in both reports under the fictional heading of "RESA #0".

For each RESA (in both reports) the participant school systems were listed, along with other data on the percent of respondents, etc. There followed a presentation of the ten highest ranked needs of that RESA, compared with the ten highest ranked needs statewide. A discussion of that data included a consideration of those comparisons. The section on each RESA and the non-RESA Group, "RESA #0", closed with a "Needs Profile Summary" which gave briefly the highlights of the administrative needs of the superintendents or principals of that RESA.

The "Summary and Conclusions" section of each report offered these observations. From the superintendents report of the 1989 study, p. 64, we reported:

> **Needs by RESA of System**
>
> "The group of school systems within any one RESA presented a profile of needs unlike that of any other. At the same time, each group included among its highest ranked needs some of the same critical needs as their peers statewide. For example, systems within RESA #3 (Central Savannah River Area) selected school-parent communication as their most critical need, the only regional group to do so. At the same time, RESA #3 superintendents selected eight of the ten highest needs also selected by the statewide group. This pattern of "unique-yet-similar" was found in each of the regional groups, including "RESA 0," the only group to designate innovations and research as its top-ranked need."
>
> "Programs of staff development organized for leaders of systems within a RESA could be guided, in part, by a study of the needs profile for that RESA, along with a review of the profile of the statewide group. A statewide priority such as strategic planning, for example, could be addressed to a specific RESA group within the context of that region's expressed needs (as for example, "School-societal problems") to enhance relevance to the participants."

From the principals 1989 study, p. 75:

Needs of Schools by RESA of System

"The most impressive outcome of this analysis was that the set of schools within each RESA has a profile of needs that is unique. Such uniqueness was expressed in a variety of ways, including:

...the selection of a highest-ranked need different from the statewide group. (See RESA's #13, #14, #16, and "#0").

...the selection of a group of high needs focussed on a single broad issue. (See RESA's #4 and #7, for examples.)

...the inclusion of many needs that were different from the statewide group. (See RESA's #1, #4, #8, #10, and #16.)

...The selection of a highest-ranked need that was different than any of the other sixteen regional groups. (See RESA's #1, #5, #6, #9, and #15)."

"State or regional staff developers, when planning programs for principals within one RESA, may be advised to study the needs data for the set of schools of that RESA and not to assume that the schools of a RESA have administrative needs reflective of the statewide pattern."

V. THE 1988 STUDIES: SPECIAL INQUIRIES

A. Administrative Needs as Perceived by Staff Development Coordinators
B. Georgia Superintendents Identify Their Most Troublesome Administrative Problems
C. Georgia Principals Identify Their Most Troublesome Administrative Problems

Introduction

Following a three-year sequence of administrative needs assessments of superintendents (1985, 1986, and 1987) and the first needs assessment of principals (1987), the Leadership Academy commissioned studies in 1988 that broke with that pattern. First, we would acquire and analyze the perceptions of Georgia's staff development coordinators, the professionals that each Georgia school system had designated as responsible for staff development functions (such designation having been required by state policy) for that school system. Such a study would broaden our understanding of statewide needs by providing a third window through which to view them.

Second, we had noted that the 1985-87 series of assessments of superintendents had yielded a high level of consistency of results, especially as to the ten highest ranked needs

in each of three surveys (See Table 3, p. 13 of this report.) This led to a decision to probe more deeply into those highest priority needs, to find out more about them in order to give further direction to Academy staff development programs rather than to continue in the series of superintendents and principals assessments.

A. The Staff Development Coordinators Study

This study replicated our earlier studies of superintendents and principals, using the same 61 administrative task areas, and asking each of Georgia's local staff development coordinators (S.D.C.'s) to rate those areas as to the level of need of each in their school *systems*. As with our earlier surveys, these 61 items described common administrative task areas and were organized into six categories: (See p. 6, above).

Each staff development coordinator rated each of the 61 task areas from zero ("no need") to four ("high need") as the S.D.C. perceived that need for his or her local school system. One hundred and fifty seven replied satisfactorily, providing a response rate of 83.5 percent.

Numerous findings were reported in the study, among them the rank and mean score of all 61 items, the percentage of S.D.C.'s rating each item as a "4" (high need), a more detailed analysis of S.D.C.'s ten highest ranked needs, and a comparison of those needs with the highest ranked needs of superintendents (1987) and principal (1987). The latter is shown below:

TABLE 11

Comparing Ten Highest Ranked Administrative Needs of Three Professional Groups

Rank	Staff Coordinators (1988) (N = 157)	Principals (1987) (N = 425)	Superintendents (1987) (N = 153)
1	Staff morale, group dynamics	Evaluating program effectiveness; implementing changes	Supervision, evaluation of staff
2	Evaluating program effectiveness; implementing changes	Stress management	Instructional supervision
3	Long, short term planning	Computers, data processing	Evaluating program effectiveness; implementing changes
4	Knowledge of curriculum/ instruction	Legal consideration	Principal's role (in management instruction)
5	Instructional supervision	Supervision, evaluation of staff	Staff morale, group dynamics
6	Supervision, evaluation of staff	Instructional supervision	Knowledge of curriculum/ instruction
7	Principal's role (in management instruction)	Time management	Knowledge/use of leadership techniques
8	School climate, learning environment	Inservice for staff (certified and classified)	Long, short term planning
9	Knowledge/use of leadership techniques	Staff morale, group dynamics	Interpersonal relationships rapport
10	Interpersonal relationship, rappport	Classroom management	School-parent communication

We also examined the perceptions of S.D.C.'s of certain task areas that were more closely related to the duties of these professionals. Additionally, we analyzed the S.D.C.'s ratings of task areas by category, such as "Management of Instruction" or "Management of Personnel", and so on.

In our "Summary and Conclusions" of that study, p. 21, we commented:

" Of the 61 needs surveyed, staff development coordinators selected staff morale and group dynamics as their most critical need,

followed by "evaluating program effectiveness; implementing changes". Long and short-term planning was their third highest ranked need."

"Comparisons between the rankings of staff development coordinators and Georgia's principals and superintendents who responded to identical surveys one year earlier are shown. Staff development coordinators view district-level concerns much more similarly to superintendents than to principals; nine of the S.D.C.'s ten highest ranked needs appeared on the list of superintendents' highest ten administrative needs, while only four are shared between S.D.C.'s and principals."

"Instructional leadership can be used as the broad heading to describe the predominant needs of school districts as viewed by staff development coordinators. Three of their highest ten ranked needs were people/relationship centered, five were leadership/supervision centered, and two were administrative/technical needs."

"Several needs were evaluated by S.D.C.'s at distinctly lower levels of concern than was expected. For example, "Staff involvement" was ranked at 21st and "In-service for staff (certified and classified) at 27th."

"Twenty-two needs were selected by the author as role-specific for staff development coordinators. Their rankings of these needs are compared with those of principals and superintendents. The rankings of all 61 needs by mean score and the percent of S.D.C.'s rating each need as "High Need" are shown."

The study accomplished its objectives, first, to inform the Leadership Academy's staff development planners as they worked statewide with local coordinators of staff development, and second, to enrich our understanding of the administrative needs of superintendents and principals by way of the perceptions of the staff development coordinators of the state.

B. & C. Georgia Superintendents/Principals Identify Their Most Troublesome Administrative Problems

In our 1988 studies we attempted to convey what we were after by suggesting this scenario: one meets the body of Georgia's superintendents (or alternatively, principals) at one time and asks, "We know which administrative needs you ranked highest in 1987, but we would like to know the specific problems that trouble you now *about* each of these

needs? " The reports we made of these two studies provided the "answers" to that hypothetical question.

In each of these two surveys we provided a set of seven possible "problems" plus one open-ended possible response for each of the ten highest ranked needs of each group from the surveys of the prior year, 1987. Each respondent was asked to identify the three of the seven problems offered which were "most troublesome", or to write in one if they felt it should have been included but had not been, for each of the ten administrative needs. Of the 186 superintendents in Georgia, 135 responded for a usable response rate of 72.6 percent. Of our sample of 403 elementary and secondary principals, 250 provided usable responses, or 62.0 percent. It is important to note that, as in all of our surveys, superintendents were asked to respond in terms of their school *systems*, while principals responded in terms of their own, *individual* schools.

In order to provide the reader with a sense of the results without either repeating them all or referencing the other documents, one table from each study will be shown here. In each case, it concerns the single highest ranked need of the prior year, for superintendents Table 12, and for principals Table13.

Table 12

The Administrative Need Ranked #1:

"Supervision, Evaluation of Staff"

(Superintendents)

Rank	Descriptors	No. of Superintendents Identifying as "Most Troublesome"	Per cent of Superintendents
	SUPERVISION, EVALUATION OF STAFF		
1	Need additional skills in dealing with improvement of marginal staff members (teachers, principals, etc.).	100	74.1
2	Need training an practice in using mandated evaluation forms.	96	71.1
2	Need training in conferencing, observation skills and formulation of improve ments or growth plans for staff.	96	71.1
4	Developing yearly goals and work plans for various staff positions.	49	36.3
5	Need to develop and learn uses of a management team for supervision.	27	20.0
6	Developing a comprehensive and on-going orientation program for new teachers/administrators.	20	14.8
7	Planning for use of teachers and/or administrators in peer supervision.	16	11.9

Reviewing Table 12 above, we find, for example, that "...dealing with marginal staff members (teachers, principals, etc.)" is a problem area that gives definition to the more general administrative need," "Supervision, evaluation of staff" - We also learned which of the other possible problem areas are of concern to many or few superintendents.

Table 13

The Administrative Need Ranked #1:

"Evaluating Program Effectiveness: Implementing Changes"

(Principals)

*Descriptors shown in rank order with number and per cent of principals identifying as among "most troublesome"**

Rank	Descriptors	No. of Principals Identifying as "Most Troublesome"	Per cent of Principals
	EVALUATING PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, IMPLEMENTING CHANGES		
1	Need defined criteria for use in identifying school/program effectiveness.	119	47.6
2	Need assistance in developing skills to manage change; i.e. diminished productivity, heightened anxiety, dissent, etc.	118	47.2
3	Increasing staff awareness of goals and their commitment to achieving these goals.	115	46.0
4	Need for additional training in needs analysis, clearly defined goals, and methods for achieving those goals.	113	45.2
5	Need to know how to develop and manage an adequate information system to determine the effectiveness of a program.	104	41.6
6	Need to correlate curriculum guides, textbooks, and learning materials when implementing change.	96	38.6
7	Need to evaluate change to determine the success of the change.	81	32.4

Similarly, a review of Table 13 reveals that "...defined criteria for use in identifying school/program effectiveness", along with those problem areas that ranked just below it, helped to flesh out what principals had in mind when they ranked "Evaluating program effectiveness; implementing change" as their highest ranked need.

*For all ten lists of descriptors, this order turned out to be different from the order in which the descriptors appeared in the surveys.

This process of identifying the critical dimensions of the ten highest ranked needs was carried out for each group surveyed. Tables and analyses comparing superintendents' and principals' responses were provided. An appendix provided a "Rank Order of 70 Problem Areas as Identified by Georgia's Superintendents" (or principals, in the alternate study).

These surveys accomplished their objective, to discover the specific dimensions of previously identified needs, to give meaning to the perceptions of superintendents and principals as to those needs, and to quantify and rank-order those specific dimensions which were termed "troublesome problems" in this study. What emerged from this pair of studies was an agenda of the specific, serious concerns of superintendents and principals. Leadership Academy planners had at their disposal indicators of the kinds of subject matter, within a broad topic, that were most important to administrators.

Summary Comments

The data organized and presented in this report are somewhat unique in that similar instrumentation and procedures were employed in annual longitudinal needs assessment studies (1985-89). As the writers analyzed these data, some significant insights were gained concerning the trends, the ebb and flow, of the felt needs of practicing school administrators. In the rise and fall of needs, we observed the effects of the two major external influences on the schools of Georgia during this period. Thoughtful persons have known for years that the schools mirror the institutional problems of society. Reflected in these data are the realities of substance abuse, family breakdown, poverty and illiteracy that create persistent training needs for school administrators. Reflected also in the data discussed here is the vividly demonstrated saga of educational reform, of the ways in which state educational policy shapes the opinions and activities of those entrusted with the administration of local public schools. We are not aware of longitudinal studies of administrative needs assessments, such as those reported here, that have reflected both (a) a critical period of societal issues related to children and, simultaneously, (b) a period of the initiation and implementation of educational reform in a state (The Quality Basic Education Act of 1985). Moreover, we are not aware of studies that show how the pressing needs of school leaders are reduced through training efforts combined with "getting on with the job" mandated at the top of the state bureaucracy.

Among the QBE-created reforms was prescriptive emphasis on the evaluation and improvement of teaching. These multi-year studies show that staff evaluation was a pressing training need immediately following the initiation of QBE; however, this task area diminished sharply as a need following the intensive statewide training programs on leader evaluation that was mounted by the Georgia Education Leadership Academy in 1988. Administrators also experienced severe staff morale problems emerging from even the most competently completed evaluations. Concerns such as these were persistent through this period, as the data show. They were intensified, we suspect, by mandates which created demands that interfered with the solution of such persistently recurring needs as program evaluation, school-and-community relations, school-parent communication, and school-societal needs (e.g., substance abuse, teen pregnancy, etc.)

We will digress for a moment from the data reviewed in these studies to consider the forces that stimulate training needs among school administrators. First, the school is a social system operating within the school district and community and beyond that, within the larger system of state government and policy. The superintendent and principal are bombarded with recurring institutional demands (inputs) from many aspects of the political, social, religious, economic and familial interests within the local and state contexts. However, when educational reform such as QBE in Georgia (and similar legislation in most other states) sweeps across the schools, local efforts shift away from recurring demands and towards meeting state mandates. Such goal displacement, intensified by the volume and the rapidity of change results in a school climate of survival, rather than one of development, with much

energy being placed in organizational maintenance activities. (See, for example, the ten highest needs of Georgia's principals, Table 8, pg. 20.)

Currently, there are some political signals that state policy may shift away from prescriptive requirements towards local district or school-based initiatives. We have suggested that such a policy shift will suggest new training concerns to replace some of the training needs stimulated by QBE reforms. We anticipate, for example, that such areas as decentralized reorganization, curriculum evaluation and revision, supervisory strategies, decision-making and staff and community involvement, among others, will cresendo in importance. We expect, also, that some QBE-stimulated concerns will persist as needs and will merit new, second-generation training programs. Staff evaluation, for example, is a need for which such training should be aimed at higher levels of more flexible and adaptive supervisory performance.

We are also impressed with two opposing, yet valid, notions about needs. First, that many training needs persist as high-ranked by administrators year after year. And second, that some priorities among needs rise or fall within a relatively short time-frame, and therefore, that staff development planners should have needs assessment data as current as possible.

Finally, we would draw several additional conclusions from the studies:

-- That superintendents and principals are not identical in their needs priorities. They differ sharply on many needs.

-- That elementary and secondary principals are much more alike than different in their needs profiles.

-- That the perceptions of staff development coordinators as to school district needs are far closer to the perceptions of superintendents than to the perceptions of principals.

-- That follow-up studies of high-ranked needs can discover the specific aspects of those needs which are of most and least concern to administrators, thus giving specific direction to staff development programs.

-- That each of the regions of Georgia has needs that are (a) identifiable, (b) similar in some aspects to the statewide samples, and (c) unique as compared with other regions.

-- That our studies in 1989 of the relationships between needs and other variables, that is, size/socioeconomic status, and cost per pupil of district have shown some results worthy of further research.

In general, stereotypes or conventional wisdom about such relationships should be shunned and, instead, needs assessments of target training groups should be carried out.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Dear Principal:

The Georgia Education Leadership Academy has asked me to conduct a survey of the administrative needs of Georgia's schools. Dr. Jimmy Puckett, the Academy's director, and I would like to ask you for your assistance which should take about 15 minutes of your time. You may know that we have previously surveyed Georgia's school superintendents. Now, with your help, we will broaden our input to include the perceptions of principals. We have had an excellent response to our surveys thus far, and we hope you feel that your reply will make our research results even more reliable and valid.

These survey results will be used to assist the Academy and other organizations to plan in-service programs for educational leaders. You will be receiving a report on the highlights of these results, in the fall.

I have enclosed for you the one-page survey form, a cover memo with brief instructions, and a self-addressed envelope. Please be assured that no individual responses will be identified.

Thank you for helping us carry out this important and useful research.

Please mail your completed survey form back to us by _____.

Jim Puckett
Director
Georgia Education Leadership Academy

Malcolm Katz
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership, Technology & Research
Georgia Southern College

TO: Principals

FROM: Jim Puckett, Georgia Education Leadership Academy
Malcolm Katz, Georgia Southern College

We hope you will assist us by doing these three things.

1. Look over the one page and think about what you believe to be the areas of most critical or important administrative needs of your own individual school.

2. Place a number from zero (0) to four (4) in the blank space in front of each item. Use a zero (0) to represent "no needs in this area." Use a four (4) to represent "high needs in this area." Please use a 1, 2, or 3 to represent a level of need between 0 (no need) and 4 (high need). Please remember that we are interested in what you consider to be the administrative needs of your own individual school, from the lowest level of need, to the highest or most critical needs.

3. Please mail back by _____.

Thank you for your cooperation.

SCHOOL SYSTEM NAME (PLEASE FILL IN)

DATE (PLEASE FILL IN)

SUPERINTENDENT'S NAME (PLEASE FILL IN)

SURVEY CODE (DO NOT CHANGE)

ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

_____Knowledge/use of leadership techniques
_____Knowledge of curriculum/instruction
_____Knowledge/use of policies, goals
_____Updating policies, procedures
_____Legal considerations
_____Short term planning
_____Strategic planning
_____Time management
_____Decision-making, problem solving
_____Crisis/conflict management
_____Organizational culture
_____Organization for curriculum development
_____Board-administrator relationships

MANAGEMENT OF STUDENTS

_____Guidance and career planning
_____Student involvement
_____Communication with students
_____School-societal problems (drug abuse, teen-pregnancy, etc.)
_____Student publications
_____Discipline, due process

COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

_____Systems for information dissemination
_____School-community communication
_____School-parent communication
_____School-staff communication
_____Computer and data processing

MANAGEMENT OF FACILITIES, SERVICES, FINANCE

Organization/coordination/delivery
_____Transportation
_____School food and nutrition
_____Maintenance and operation
_____Budgeting, preparation and control
_____Accounting, record keeping
_____Purchase and distribution
_____Financial reports
_____Pupil accounting (F.T.E.)
_____Capital outlay projects
_____Managing federal and state projects and programs

MANAGEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

_____Principal's role
_____Defined K-12 curriculum
_____Appropriate materials/equipment
_____Varied resources to meet needs
_____Evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes
_____Vertical/horizontal organization
_____Scheduling, lesson planning, time on task
_____Testing, placement, promotion/retention
_____Assessing, reporting student progress/grading
_____Innovations, research
_____Classroom management
_____Extra curricular programs
_____School climate, learning environment
_____Instructional supervision

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

_____Task differentiation, clarity
_____Supervision, evaluation of staff
_____Staff morale, group dynamics
_____Interpersonal relationships, rapport
_____Staff involvement
_____In-service for staff (certified and classified)
_____Staff, corrective discipline
_____Employee benefits
_____Recruitment, selection of personnel
_____Merit plans
_____Career ladders
_____Absenteeism
_____Stress management

APPENDIX B

SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL SYSTEM NEEDS, 1985, 1986, 1987, AND 1989

RANK					MEAN SCORE				% OF SUPTS. RATING AS A "4" (HIGH NEED)			
1985	1986	1987	1989	Task Area	1985	1986	1987	1989	1985	1986	1987	1989
1	1	1	9	Supervision, evaluation of staff	3.242	3.393	3.257	2.8113	47	58	55	28
2	2	2	4	Instructional supervision	3.120	3.273	3.168	2.9000	41	51	47	33
3	3	3	6	Evaluating program effectiveness, implementing change	3.089	3.239	3.063	2.8797	38	45	38	29
4	4	6	5	Knowledge of curriculum/instruction	2.981	3.123	2.980	2.8854	37	41	36	30
5	4	4	11	Principals role (in management of instruction)	2.962	3.123	3.034	2.7610	39	47	45	26
6	6	5	2	Staff morale, group dynamics	2.936	3.018	2.993	3.0380	32	37	37	35
7	9	10	7	School parent communication	2.898	2.938	2.767	2.8608	30	31	29	29
8	7	7	14	Knowledge/use of leadership techniques	2.892	2.988	2.894	2.7342	37	39	33	26
9	11	12	10	School community communication	2.866	2.827	2.693	2.8101	30	29	24	28
10	14	8	3	Strategic planning*	2.854	2.762	2.838	2.9937	28	27	29	41
---	---	---**	1	School-societal problems (drug abuse teen pregnancy, etc.)	-----	-----	-----	3.0443	---	---	-----	38
---	---	---	33	Short-term planning	-----	-----	-----	2.4038	---	---	-----	13

* Was "Long, short-term planning", 1985-1987
** Blank indicates task area not included that year

Appendix B (continued)

RANK					MEAN SCORE				% OF SUPTS. RATING AS A "4" (HIGH NEED)			
1985	1986	1987	1989	Task Area	1985	1986	1987	1989	1985	1986	1987	1989
11	13	24	29	Computer, data processing	2.840	2.772	2.547	2.5063	30	27	20	19
12	16	13	25	Defined K-12 curriculum	2.739	2.750	2.676	2.5414	31	27	26	19
13	26	15	26	Systems for information dissemination	2.732	2.607	2.660	2.5380	28	23	27	16
14	15	19	15	Staff involvement	2.707	2.759	2.590	2.7325	20	21	17	23
15	8	9	8	Interpersonal relations, rapport	2.699	2.957	2.829	2.8535	27	31	28	28
16	10	22	13	School climate, learning environment	2.679	2.871	2.562	2.7468	24	33	22	28
17	43	56	61	Career ladders	2.647	2.280	1.867	1.2803	29	21	11	09
18	40	36	44	Absenteeism (personnel)	2.643	2.329	2.363	2.1911	24	19	22	18
19	27	23	18	Legal considerations	2.641	2.654	2.547	2.6624	29	22	24	28
20	19	11	12	School-staff communications	2.637	2.695	2.740	2.7468	22	24	27	28
21	23	18	23	Decision making, problem solving	2.631	2.667	2.632	2.5478	25	28	22	21
22	12	16	16	Classroom management	2.608	2.787	2.647	2.7278	18	27	24	22
23	30	30	27	Time management	2.605	2.537	2.500	2.5350	18	22	15	18
24	25	28	37	Testing, placement, promotion/retention	2.570	2.620	2.511	2.3608	21	20	14	14
25	21	14	24	Inservice for staff (certified and classified)	2.567	2.677	2.673	2.5449	18	24	25	18
26	28	20	31	Budgeting, preparation and control	2.564	2.558	2.586	2.4331	25	30	31	28
27	33	27	28	Stress management	2.558	2.497	2.517	2.5253	21	18	22	25
28	17	17	31	Scheduling, lesson planning, time-on-task	2.557	2.735	2.645	2.4331	18	21	21	17

Appendix B (continued)

RANK					MEAN SCORE				% OF SUPTS. RATING AS A "4" (HIGH NEED)			
1985	1986	1987	1989	Task Area	1985	1986	1987	1989	1985	1986	1987	1989
29	29	34	41	Assessing, reporting student progress/ grading	2.538	2.556	2.376	2.2516	18	16	13	10
30	20	26	19	Crisis, conflict management	2.532	2.681	2.524	2.6266	21	24	23	21
31	37	38	38	Task differentiation, clarity	2.529	2.398	2.329	2.3269	16	10	11	09
32	18	21	-----	Defined expectancies, disciplinary procedures	2.510	2.699	2.577	———	23	24	20	----
33	31	31	22	Guidance, career planning	2.503	2.519	2.480	2.5500	18	17	15	19
34	21	25	30	Organization for curriculum development	2.494	2.677	2.534	2.4645	20	24	20	14
35	32	29	17	Communication with students	2.481	2.503	2.510	2.6795	17	16	19	21
36	24	33	34	Staff, corrective discipline	2.471	2.640	2.410	2.3974	19	24	14	12
37	34	39	39	Knowledge/use of policies, goals	2.420	2.457	2.893	2.3248	19	21	14	16
38	35	35	20	Discipline, due process (students)	2.401	2.421	2.369	2.5570	20	16	15	19
39	35	44	45	Maintenance and operation (facilities)	2.362	2.421	2.151	2.1847	13	15	14	09
40	39	37	36	Recruitment, selection of personnel	2.350	2.340	2.340	2.3758	25	22	17	21
41	48	43	-----	Management by objectives (administration)	2.321	2.185	2.162	———	12	12	07	----
42	41	42	35	Innovations, research	2.316	2.306	2.266	2.3822	13	12	10	13
43	50	46	-----	Energy conservation (facilities)	2.306	2.130	2.090	———	10	12	11	----
44	53	60	60	Merit plans	2.304	2.000	1.643	1.3782	23	13	07	06
45	42	40	21	Student involvement	2.274	2.296	2.894	2.5506	20	08	07	18

Appendix B (continued)

RANK					MEAN SCORE				% OF SUPTS. RATING AS A "4" (HIGH NEED)			
1985	1986	1987	1989	Task Area	1985	1986	1987	1989	1985	1986	1987	1989
46	38	32	47	Accounting, record keeping	2.217	2.350	2.441	2.1456	18	20	22	15
47	44	41	43	Updating policies, procedures	2.197	2.270	2.283	2.1935	20	16	16	16
48	46	47	40	Varied resources to meet needs (instruction)	2.177	2.224	2.083	2.2911	07	07	07	11
49	47	49	-----	Resource utilization, professional, community	2.174	2.190	2.021	———	09	10	05	----
50	45	45	42	Appropriate materials, equipment	2.139	2.259	2.130	2.2258	07	10	08	08
51	49	52	46	Board-administrator relations	2.065	2.179	1.986	2.1818	15	21	14	18
52	54	51	48	Purchasing and distribution	2.064	1.994	2.014	2.0255	11	08	06	09
53	55	48	49	Captial outlay projects	2.045	1.951	2.041	2.0064	13	13	15	16
54	52	54	55	Financial reports	2.025	2.068	1.903	1.8726	12	13	08	08
55	50	50	53	Verical/horizontal organization (instruction)	1.967	2.130	2.014	1.9299	06	10	06	04
56	57	57	49	Transportation	1.896	1.843	1.836	2.0064	08	07	11	10
57	56	58	57	School food and nutrition	1.876	1.936	1.747	1.8599	04	07	05	05
58	58	53	56	Managing federal and staff projects and programs	1.854	1.791	1.910	1.8718	08	09	06	08
59	59	55	52	Employee benefits	1.813	1.720	1.889	1.9359	06	07	07	08
60	60	59	54	Extra-curricular programs	1.731	1.700	1.723	1.8903	04	02	04	07
61	61	61	59	Student publications	1.724	1.593	1.631	1.7564	04	02	03	04

Appendix B (continued)

RANK					MEAN SCORE				% OF SUPTS. RATING AS A "4" (HIGH NEED)			
1985	1986	1987	1989	Task Area	1985	1986	1987	1989	1985	1986	1987	1989
---	---	---	58	Organizational culture	----	----	----	1.8194	---	---	----	03
---	---	---	51	Pupil accouting (F.T.E.)	----	----	----	1.9423	---	---	----	13

Appendix C

Superintendents Ratings Ranked by Change Over 1985 - 1989

Item	STD	CHG
career ladders	.51	-1.37
merit plans	.35	-.93
student involvement	.25	.28
knowledge/use of policies goals	.22	-.10
supervision, evaluation of staff	.22	-.43
absenteeism (personnel)	.16	-.45
computer, data processing	.14	-.33
instructional supervision	.14	-.22
principals role (in management of instruction	.13	-.20
evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	.13	-.21
assessing, reporting student progress	.12	-.29
accounting, record keeping	.11	-.07
maintenance and operation (facilities)	.11	-.18
school climate, learning environment	.11	.07
scheduling, lession planning, time-on-task	.11	-.12
testing, placement, promotion/ retention	.10	-.21
staff, corrective discipline	.10	-.07
energy conservation (facilities)	.09	
interpersonal relations, rapport	.09	.15
knowledge/use of leadership technique	.09	-.16
knowledge of curriculum, instruction	.08	-.10
strategic planning	.08	.14
defined k-12 curriculum	.08	-.20
board-administrator relations	.08	.12
task differentiation, clarity	.08	-.20
employee benefits	.08	.12
organization for curriculum development	.08	-.03
financial reports	.08	-.15
communication with students	.08	.20
defined expectations, disciplinary	.08	
resource utilization, professional	.08	
varied resources to meet needs	.08	.11
extra-curricular programs	.08	.16
vertical/horizontal organization	.08	-.04
discipline, due process (students)	.07	.16
systems for information dissemination	.07	-.19
management by objectives (administrative)	.07	
classroom management	.07	.12
school food and nutrition	.07	-.02
transportation	.07	.11
student publications	.07	.03
crisis, conflict management	.07	.09
staff involvement	.06	.03
school community communication	.06	-.06
school parent communication	.06	-.04
inservice for staff (certified and classified)	.06	-.02
budgeting, preparation and control	.06	-.13
appropriate materials, equipment	.06	.09
legal considerations	.05	.02
school-staff communications	.04	.11
decision making, problem solving	.04	-.08
managing federal and staff projects	.04	.02
innovations, research	.04	.07
updating policies, procedures	.04	.00
staff morall, group dynamics	.04	.10
time management	.04	-.07
capital outlay projects	.04	-.04
purchasing and distributing	.03	-.04
guidance, career planning	.03	-.05
stress management	.02	-.03
recruitment, selection of personnel	.01	.03
school-societal problems		
short-term planning		
organizational culture		
pupil accounting (f.t.e.)		
AVERAGE	.10	
STD	.08	
MIN	.01	
MAX	.51	

Appendix D

Principals Ratings and Needs by Mean Score, 1987 and 1989 Ranked by 1987 Mean

RANKED BY 1987 MEAN ITEM	1987	1989	AVERAGE	STD
evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	2.72	2.55	2.64	.09
stress management	2.68	2.74	2.71	.03
computer, data processing	2.68	2.41	2.55	.14
legal considerations	2.64	2.59	2.61	.02
supervision, evaluation of staff	2.62	2.12	2.37	.25
instructional supervision	2.57	2.29	2.43	.14
time management	2.56	2.50	2.53	.03
inservice for staff (certified and classified)	2.51	2.27	2.39	.12
staff morale, group dynamics	2.49	2.62	2.55	.06
classroom management	2.44	2.36	2.40	.04
knowledge of curriculum, instruction	2.42	2.20	2.31	.11
innovations, research	2.42	2.35	2.38	.03
staff, corrective discipline	2.40	2.19	2.29	.10
crisis, conflict management	2.37	2.50	2.44	.07
scheduling, lesson planning, time-on-task	2.36	2.18	2.27	.09
staff involvement	2.34	2.35	2.34	.01
school parent communication	2.33	2.38	2.36	.02
school community communication	2.31	2.43	2.37	.06
school climate, learning environment	2.30	2.26	2.28	.02
principals role (in management of instruction)	2.28	2.12	2.20	.08
defined expectancies, disciplinary	2.24		2.24	
decision making, problem solving	2.23	2.14	2.19	.05
organization for curriculum development	2.23	2.12	2.18	.06
systems for information dissemination	2.23	2.22	2.22	.01
testing, placement, promotion/retention	2.23	2.04	2.13	.09
interpersonal relations, rapport	2.22	2.29	2.26	.03
defined K-12 curriculum	2.20	2.01	2.11	.10
varied resources to meet needs	2.13	2.15	2.14	.01
career leaders	2.13	1.36	1.74	.38
school-staff communications	2.10	2.13	2.12	.01
knowledge/use of leadership techniques	2.09	1.99	2.04	.05
student involvement	2.08	2.08	2.08	.00
appropriate materials, equipment	2.06	1.99	2.03	.03
assessing, reporting student progress	2.06	1.85	1.95	.10
discipline, due process (students)	2.05	2.27	2.16	.11
recruitment, selection of personnel	2.04	1.95	2.00	.04
resource utilization, professional	2.04		2.04	
guidance, career planning	2.03	1.95	1.99	.04
absenteeism (personnel)	2.01	1.88	1.95	.06
task differentiation, clarity	2.00	1.86	1.93	.07
management by objectives (administrative)	2.00		2.00	
merit plans	1.95	1.48	1.71	.23
communication with students	1.92	2.03	1.97	.06
knowledge/use of policies, goals	1.89	1.80	1.85	.04
vertical/horizontal organization	1.87	1.77	1.82	.05

Appendix D (continued)

ITEM	1987	1989	AVERAGE	STD
budgeting, preparation and control	1.87	1.99	1.93	.06
updating policies, procedures	1.79	1.65	1.72	.07
accounting, record keeping	1.78	1.68	1.73	.05
board-administrator relations	1.77	1.61	1.69	.08
employee benefits	1.67	1.68	1.67	.01
capital outlay projects	1.57	1.51	1.54	.03
energy conservation (facilities)	1.54		1.54	
extra-curricular programs	1.54	1.52	1.53	.01
managing federal and staff projects	1.53	1.41	1.47	.06
student publications	1.53	1.56	1.55	.02
purchasing and distribution	1.50	1.56	1.53	.03
financial reports	1.47	1.44	1.45	.01
school food and nutrition	1.43	1.34	1.38	.05
maintenance and operation (facilities)	1.43	1.88	1.65	.23
transportation	1.28	1.25	1.27	.01
strategic planning		2.45	2.45	
school-societal problems		2.62	2.62	
short-term planning		1.92	1.92	
organizational culture		1.64	1.64	
pupil accounting (f.t.e.)		1.50	1.50	
AVERAGE	2.09	2.02	2.05	.07
STD	.36	.37	.36	.07
MIN	1.92	1.36	1.71	.00
MAX	2.72	2.74	2.71	.38

APPENDIX E

PRINCIPALS' ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS, 1987 AND 1989
SUMMARY

Rank All Principals 1987	Rank All Principals 1989	Task Area	Mean Score 1987	Mean Score 1989	% All Principals Rating as a "4" (High Need) 1987	% All Principals Rating as a "4" (High Need) 1989	Rank, Elementary Principals (By mean score) 1987	Rank, Elementary Principals (By mean score) 1989	Rank, Secondary Principals (By mean score) 1987	Rank, Secondary Principals (By mean score) 1989
1	5	Evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	2.723	2.5509	31	26	1	4	2	4
2	1	Stress management	2.684	2.7366	28	31	3	1	4	3
3	10	Computer and data processing	2.681	2.4098	30	34	2	8	9	17
4	4	Legal considerations	2.635	2.5872	28	31	4	3	5	8
5	27	Supervision, evaluation of staff	2.621	2.1205	33	19	5	29	1	21
6	16	Instructional supervision	2.570	2.2887	33	24	6	18	6	6
7	6	Time management	2.556	2.5039	27	31	7	6	3	5
8	17	In-service for staff (certified and classified)	2.505	2.2683	19	18	8	17	7	27
9	3	Staff morale, group dynamics	2.489	2.6176	28	32	9	2	8	2
10	12	Classroom management	2.436	2.3599	24	22	11	13	15	13
11	21	Knowledge of curriculum/instruction	2.416	2.2021	27	20	14	23	10	16
12	13	Innovations, research	2.415	2.3540	20	19	10	11	23	22
13	22	Staff, corrective discipline	2.398	2.1886	22	18	13	20	18	32
14	6	Crisis, conflict management	2.370	2.5039	22	27	12	5	30	7
15	-----*	Long, short term planning	2.366	———	19	—	15	—	21	—
-----	39	Short term planning	———	1.9243	—	10	—	38	—	35

Appendix E (continued)

Rank All Principals 1987	Rank All Principals 1989	Task Area	Mean Score 1987	Mean Score 1989	% All Principals Rating as a "4" (High Need) 1987	% All Principals Rating as a "4" (High Need) 1989	Rank, Elementary Principals (By mean score) 1987	Rank, Elementary Principals (By mean score) 1989	Rank, Secondary Principals (By mean score) 1987	Rank, Secondary Principals (By mean score) 1989
-----	2	School, societal problems (drug abuse, teen pregnancy, etc.)	—	2.6247	—	30	—	9	----	1
-----	8	Strategic planning	—	2.4519	—	22	—	7	----	11
16	23	Scheduling, lesson planning, time on task	2.356	2.1846	22	17	16	22	20	30
17	14	Staff involvement	2.339	2.3505	19	21	18	14	11	15
18	11	School-parent communication	2.334	2.3821	20	23	20	12	13	8
19	9	School-community communication	2.310	2.4333	18	21	27	10	12	8
20	19	School climate, learning environment	2.301	2.2552	24	20	22	19	14	13
21	29	Principal's role	2.275	2.1179	24	25	17	28	31	25
22	----	Defined expectancies, disciplinary procedures	2.235	———	22	—	23	—	29	—
23	25	Decision-making, problem solving	2.234	2.1429	20	18	21	26	37	29
24	15	Interpersonal relationships, rapport	2.223	2.2912	20	21	24	16	24	20
25	28	Organization for curriculum development	2.232	2.1189	27	14	26	25	43	41
26	20	Systems for information dissemination	2.231	2.2182	16	17	27	21	19	17
27	31	Testing, placement, promotion/retention	2.228	2.0413	18	14	19	30	39	44
28	33	Defined K-12 curriculum	2.204	2.0103	23	15	25	31	28	39
29	24	Varied resources to meet needs	2.134	2.1536	12	13	31	24	40	31

* Blanks indicate task area not included in that year

Appendix E (continued)

Rank All Principals 1987	Rank All Principals 1989	Task Area	Mean Score 1987	Mean Score 1989	% All Principals Rating as a "4" (High Need) 1987	% All Principals Rating as a "4" (High Need) 1989	Rank, Elementary Principals (By mean score) 1987	Rank, Elementary Principals (By mean score) 1989	Rank, Secondary Principals (By mean score) 1987	Rank, Secondary Principals (By mean score) 1989
30	59	Career ladders	2.126	1.3568	22	09	29	59	47	58
31	26	School-staff communication	2.104	2.1279	18	19	34	27	26	23
32	34	Knowledge/use of leadership techniques	2.092	1.9949	22	16	32	35	42	28
33	30	Student involvement	2.079	2.0805	13	11	39	33	35	12
34	35	Appropriate materials/equipment	2.061	1.9922	15	13	37	34	32	36
35	43	Assessing, reporting student progress/ grading	2.058	1.8490	13	09	35	41	36	44
36	18	Discipline, due process	2.046	2.2674	20	23	33	15	49	39
37	——	Resource utilization: profession, community	2.039	------	09	—	36	—	17	—
38	37	Recruitment, selection of personnel	2.039	1.9535	20	17	40	36	32	41
39	38	Guidance and career planning	2.033	1.9481	18	16	44	39	22	25
40	40	Absenteeism	2.012	1.8831	19	14	42	43	27	17
41	42	Task differentiation, clarity	1.998	1.8620	11	07	38	42	46	38
41	——	Management by objectives	1.998	------	09	—	41	—	38	—
43	57	Merit plans	1.946	1.4778	20	10	29	55	52	57
44	32	Communication with students	1.915	2.0285	16	15	47	32	34	33
45	44	Knowledge/use of policies, goals	1.890	1.8016	15	11	45	44	45	46
46	45	Vertical/horizontal organization	1.870	1.7664	09	07	43	45	53	48
47	36	Budgeting, preparation and control	1.868	1.9870	13	14	49	37	25	23

Appendix E (continued)

Rank All Principals 1987	Rank All Principals 1989	Task Area	Mean Score 1987	Mean Score 1989	% All Principals Rating as a "4" (High Need) 1987	% All Principals Rating as a "4" (High Need) 1989	Rank, Elementary Principals (By mean score) 1987	Rank, Elementary Principals (By mean score) 1989	Rank, Secondary Principals (By mean score) 1987	Rank, Secondary Principals (By mean score) 1989
48	48	Updating policies, procedures	1.788	1.6510	10	07	48	49	51	49
49	46	Accounting, record keeping	1.784	1.6822	10	10	50	48	44	43
50	50	Board-administration relationships	1.770	1.6146	12	11	51	50	16	47
51	47	Employee benefits	1.666	1.6762	11	10	52	46	54	51
52	54	Capital outlay projects	1.565	1.5104	09	08	57	54	48	56
53	53	Extra curricular programs	1.542	1.5209	07	05	56	58	50	34
54	—	Energy conservation	1.542	—	07	—	54	—	55	—
55	56	Managing federal and state projects and programs	1.531	1.4805	07	07	55	52	58	61
56	51	Student publications	1.526	1.5648	05	05	53	51	59	55
57	52	Purchase and distribution	1.502	1.5622	05	06	58	53	55	50
58	58	Financial reports	1.466	1.4430	07	07	60	57	55	54
59	41	Maintenance and operation	1.428	1.8817	13	14	46	40	41	37
59	60	School food and nutrition	1.429	1.3368	06	05	59	60	60	59
61	61	Transportation	1.276	1.2545	06	08	61	61	61	60
-----	49	Organizational culture	———	1.6430	—	05	—	47	—	53
-----	55	Pupil accounting (F.T.E.)	———	1.4962	—	09	—	56	—	51

Appendix F

Principals Ratings Ranked by Change over 1987 and 1989

PRINCIPALS -- AVERAGE 1987-1989 (RANK - ITEM)

Item	STD	CHG	Item	STD	CHG
career ladders	.38	-.77	vertical/horizontal organization	.05	-.10
supervision, evaluation of staff	.25	-.50	accounting, record keeping	.05	-.10
merit plans	.23	-.47	knowledge/use of leadership techniques	.05	-.10
maintenance and operation (facilities)	.23	-.45	school food and nutrition	.05	-.09
instructional supervision	.14	-.28	decision making, problem solving	.05	-.09
computer, data processing	.14	-.27	knowledge/use of policies, goals	.04	-.09
inservice for staff (certified and classified)	.12	-.24	recruitment, selection of personnel	.04	-.09
discipline, due process (students)	.11	.22	guidance, career planning	.04	-.08
knowledge of curriculm, instruction	.11	-.21	classroom management	.04	-.08
staff, corrective discipline	.10	-.21	appropriate materials, equipment	.03	-.07
assessing, reporting student progress	.10	-.21	interpersonal relations, rapport	.03	.07
defined k-12 curriculum	.10	-.19	innovations, research	.03	-.06
testing, placement, promotion/retention	.09	-.19	purchasing and distribution	.03	.06
evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	.09	-.17	capital outlay projects	.03	-.05
scheduling, lession planning, time-on-task	.09	-.17	stress management	.03	.05
principals role (in management of instruction)	.08	-.16	time management	.03	-.05
board-administrator relations	.08	-.16	school parent communication	.02	.05
updating policies, procedures	.07	-.14	legal considerations	.02	-.05
task differentiation, clarity	.07	-.14	school climate, learning environment	.02	-.05
crisis, conflict management	.07	.13	student publications	.02	.04
absenteeism (personnel)	.06	-.13	school-staff communications	.01	.02
staff morale, group dynamics	.06	.13	financial reports	.01	-.02
managing federal and staff projects	.06	-.13	transportation	.01	-.02
school community communication	.06	.12	extra-curricular programs	.01	-.02
budgeting, preparation and control	.06	.12	varied resources to meet needs	.01	.02
communication with students	.06	.11	systems for information disemination	.01	-.01
organization for curriculum development	.06	-.11	staff involvement	.01	.01
			employee benefits	.01	.01
			student involvement	.00	.00

Appendix G

Principals Ratings by Rank of Average Mean for Item, 1987 and 1989

PRINCIPALS -- AVERAGE 1987 - 1989 (RANK ITEM)

stress management	2.71
evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	2.64
school-societal problems	2.62
legal consideratons	2.61
staff morale, group dynamics	2.55
computer, data processing	2.55
time management	2.53
strategic planning	2.45
crisis, conflict management	2.44
instructional supervision	2.43
classroom management	2.40
inservice for staff (certified and classified)	2.39
innovations, research	2.38
school community communication	2.37
supervision, evaluation of staff	2.37
school parent communication	2.36
staff involvement	2.34
knowledge of curriculum, instruction	2.31
staff, corrective discipline	2.29
school climate, learning environment	2.28
scheduling, lesson planning, time-on-task	2.27
interpersonal relations, rapport	2.26
defined expectancies, disciplinary	2.24
systems for information dissemination	2.22
principals role (in manage of instruction)	2.20
decision making, problem solving	2.19
organization for curriculum development	2.18
discipline, due process (students)	2.16
varied resources to meet needs	2.14
testing, placement, promotion/retention	2.13
school-staff communications	2.12
defined K-12 curriculum	2.11
student involvement	2.08
knowledge/use of leadership techniques	2.04
resource utilization, professionl,	2.04
appropriate materials, equipment	2.03
management by objectives (administrative)	2.00
recruitment, selection of personnel	2.00
guidance, career planning	1.99
communication with students	1.97
assessing, reporting student progress	1.95
absenteeism (personnel)	1.95
task differentiation, clarity	1.93
budgeting, preparation and control	1.93
short-term planning	1.92
knowledge/use of policies, goals	1.85
vertical/horizontal organization	1.82
career ladders	1.74
accounting, record keeping	1.73
updating policies, procedures	1.72
merit plans	1.71
board-administrator relations	1.69
employee benefits	1.67
maintenance and operation (facilities)	1.65
organizational culture	1.64
student publications	1.55
energy conservation (facilities)	1.54
capital outlay projects	1.54
purchasing and distribution	1.53
extra-curricular programs	1.53
pupil accounting (f.t.e.)	1.50
managing federal and staff projects	1.47
financial reports	1.45
school food and nutrition	1.38
transportation	1.27
AVERAGE	2.05
STD	.36
MIN	1.93
MAX	2.71

Appendix H

Superintendents Ratings of Needs Ranked by Mean Score By Year For 1985 - 1989, Ranked By 1985 Mean

ITEM	RANKED HIGH TO LOW 1985 MEANS 1985	1986	1987	1989	AVERAGE	STD
supervision, evaluation of staff	3.24	3.39	3.26	2.81	3.18	.22
instructional supervision	3.12	3.27	3.17	2.90	3.12	.14
evaluating program effectiveness, implementing changes	3.09	3.24	3.06	2.88	3.07	.13
knowledge of curriculum, instruction	2.98	3.12	2.98	2.89	2.99	.08
principals role (in management of instruction)	2.96	3.12	3.03	2.76	2.97	.13
staff morale, group dynamics	2.94	3.02	2.99	3.04	3.00	.04
school parent communication	2.90	2.94	2.77	2.86	2.87	.06
knowledge/use of leadership technique	2.89	2.99	2.89	2.73	2.88	.09
school community communication	2.87	2.83	2.69	2.81	2.80	.06
strategic planning	2.85	2.76	2.84	2.99	2.86	.08
computer, data processing	2.84	2.77	2.55	2.51	2.67	.14
defined K-12 curriculum	2.74	2.75	2.68	2.54	2.68	.08
systems for information dissemination	2.73	2.61	2.66	2.54	2.63	.07
staff involvement	2.71	2.76	2.59	2.73	2.70	.06
interpersonal relations, rapport	2.70	2.96	2.83	2.85	2.83	.09
school climate, learning environment	2.68	2.87	2.56	2.75	2.71	.11
career ladders	2.65	2.28	1.87	1.28	2.02	.51
absenteeism (personnel)	2.64	2.33	2.36	2.19	2.38	.16
legal considerations	2.64	2.65	2.55	2.66	2.63	.05
school-staff communications	2.64	2.70	2.74	2.75	2.70	.04
decision making, problem solving	2.63	2.67	2.63	2.55	2.62	.04
classroom management	2.61	2.79	2.65	2.73	2.69	.07
time management	2.61	2.54	2.50	2.54	2.54	.04
testing, placement, promotion/retention	2.57	2.62	2.51	2.36	2.52	.10
inservice for staff (certified and classified)	2.57	2.68	2.67	2.54	2.62	.06
budgeting, preparation and control	2.56	2.56	2.59	2.43	2.54	.06
stress management	2.56	2.50	2.52	2.53	2.52	.02
scheduling, lesson planning, time-on-task	2.56	2.74	2.65	2.43	2.59	.11
assessing, reporting student progress	2.54	2.56	2.387	2.25	2.43	.12
crisis, conflict management	2.53	2.68	2.52	2.63	2.59	.07
task differentiation, clarity	2.53	2.40	2.33	2.33	2.40	.08
defined expectancies, disciplinary	2.51	2.70	2.58		2.60	.08
guidance, career planning	2.50	2.52	2.48	2.55	2.51	.03
organization for curriculum development	2.49	2.68	2.53	2.46	2.54	.08
communication with students	2.48	2.50	2.51	2.68	2.54	.08
staff, corrective discipline	2.47	2.64	2.41	2.40	2.48	.10
knowledge/use of policies, goals	2.42	2.46	2.89	2.32	2.52	.22
discipline, due process (students)	2.40	2.42	2.37	2.56	2.44	.07
maintenance and operation (facilities)	2.36	2.42	2.15	2.18	2.28	.11
recruitment, selection of personnel	2.35	2.34	2.34	2.38	2.35	.01
management by objectives (administrative)	2.32	2.19	2.16		2.22	.07
innovations, research	2.32	2.31	2.27	2.38	2.32	.04
energy conservation (facilities)	2.31	2.13	2.09		2.18	.09
merit plans	2.30	2.00	1.64	1.38	1.83	.35
student involvement	2.27	2.30	2.89	2.55	2.50	.25
accounting, record keeping	2.22	2.35	2.44	2.15	2.29	.11

Appendix H (continued)

ITEM	RANKED HIGH TO LOW 1985 MEANS 1985	1986	1987	1989	AVERAGE	STD
updating policies, procedures	2.20	2.27	2.28	2.19	2.24	.04
varied resources to meet needs	2.18	2.22	2.08	2.29	2.19	.08
resource utilization, professional	2.17	2.19	2.02		2.13	.08
appropriate materials, equipment	2.14	2.26	2.13	2.23	2.19	.06
board-administrator relations	2.07	2.18	1.99	2.18	2.10	.08
purchasing and distribution	2.06	1.99	2.01	2.03	2.02	.03
capital outlay projects	2.05	1.95	2.04	2.01	2.01	.04
financial reports	2.03	2.07	1.90	1.87	1.97	.08
vertical/horizontal organization	1.97	2.13	2.01	1.93	2.01	.08
transportation	1.90	1.84	1.84	2.01	1.90	.07
school food and nutrition	1.88	1.94	1.75	1.86	1.85	.07
managing federal and staff projects	1.85	1.79	1.91	1.87	1.86	.04
employee benefits	1.81	1.72	1.89	1.94	1.84	.08
extra-curricular programs	1.73	1.70	1.72	1.89	1.76	.08
student publications	1.72	1.59	1.63	1.76	1.68	.07
school-societal problems				3.04	3.04	
short-term planning				2.40	2.40	
organizational culture				1.82	1.82	
pupil accounting (F.T.E.)				1.94	1.94	
AVERAGE	2.47	2.49	2.43	2.39	2.44	.10
STD	.35	.40	.39	.39	.37	.08
MIN	1.72	1.59	1.63	1.28	1.68	.01
MAX	3.24	3.39	3.26	3.04	3.18	.51